Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2007 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

http://www.archive.org/details/churchnochurch00horeuoft

R Theol
H

CHURCH AND NO CHURCH.

BY
THE REV. A. H. HORE, M.A.,
CHAPLAIN TO THE FORCES, AND LATE SENIOR CHAPLAIN AT DOVER.

"When the Son of Man cometh, shall He find Faith on the earth?"
S. Luke. xviii. 8.

321925
4. 12. 35

LONDON:
J. T. HAYES, LYALL PLACE, EATON SQUARE; AND
4, HENRIETTA STREET, COVENT GARDEN.

1873.

LONDON:
SWIFT AND CO., REGENT PRESS, KING STREET,
REGENT STREET, W.

CONTENTS.

		PAGE
PREFACE	. . . . .	v
CHAP.		
I.	THE ESTABLISHED CHURCH	1
II.	PROTESTANTISM	19
III.	CATHOLICISM	36
IV.	RITUALISM	54
V.	RATIONALISM	70
VI.	NONCONFORMITY	87
VII.	ROMANISM	107
VIII.	THE REFORMATION	128
IX.	THE REFORMATION DID NOT UNCATHOLICIZE THE CHURCH	147
X.	CHURCH DISCIPLINE AND THE PRIVY COUNCIL	165
XI.	WHAT WILL BE THE FUTURE RELIGION OF ENGLAND	182

PREFACE.

We live in days of great social and scientific progress; of increasing knowledge and mental activity; when to be behind the age, or not to keep pace with the advance of the day, implies an ignorance of subjects which form part of the ordinary education of the English gentleman.

But with regard to religion, it is not too much to say that the great number of English Churchmen, although they talk much about the Church, and perhaps call themselves Protestants, understand but little what the Church really is, or what Protestantism means; and can give no reason why they are Churchmen, and not Wesleyans or Independents.

To stand apart from Church Politics, and to profess not to be a "Party-man," is somewhat

unreasonable at a time when a Party has arisen within the Church which inculcates the free-handling and treatment of the Bible as an ordinary book; which lays down an axiom that not faith but scepticism, not revelation but philosophy, is the foundation of Religion; which demands the elimination of all Creeds and Dogma from the Church of the future.

The struggle is no longer now with respect to the right of private judgment and the authority of the Church; but the most fundamental doctrines of the Bible and the very existence of the Church are openly threatened.

The good ship of the Church having parted from its old moorings of Catholicism, and tossed about on the stormy ocean of Protestantism, is in danger of being wrecked on the shoals of Infidelity.

The object of this little book is to give some account of the different schools of thought, which aid or impede the progress of religion; and to show the necessity, never greater than at present, of holding to the one Catholic and

Apostolic Faith, at a time when people are doubtfully asking, not what will be the future religion of England, but whether there will be any religion at all.

Tunbridge Wells, 1873.

Since the following pages were sent to Press, Mr. Miall's motion for the Disestablishment of the Church has been rejected in Parliament by the great majority of nearly 300 votes, in an unusually full, but somewhat unsympathetic and impatient House. From this Division it is not unreasonable to infer that the question of Disestablishment has, for the present at least, diminished in interest, and that any immediate danger of Disestablishment is postponed. That it was not treated as a Party matter is clear; for whilst 230 Conservatives voted with the majority, the Liberal Party, who may be considered Mr. Miall's friends, also voted against him almost in the majority of two to one. Or if we take the Irish votes, we find a majority of twelve to one objecting to a similar process being applied

to the Church in England as was applied to the Irish Church. Nonconformity has learnt the wholesome lesson, that the country, whilst it has been ready to remove from it all substantial grievances and to accord it full liberty, is not willing to entertain mere sentimental notions of equality, which without benefiting the cause of Nonconformity, would seriously imperil the civil and religious well-being of the community.

It is observable that Roman Catholics, almost to a man, refrained from voting. It would be well in future if all other classes of Dissenters, either in their place in Parliament, or as members of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, would refrain from voting, or refuse to sit in judgment, on the doctrines or discipline of the Church, from which they profess to dissent, of the laws of which they probably know but little, and with the interests of which they are, at the most, only indirectly concerned.

CHURCH AND NO CHURCH.

Chapter I.

THE ESTABLISHED CHURCH.

THE connexion which exists between Church and State, and which has for so many centuries proved the great bulwark of the Constitution, has of late years become the best abused institution in the land. It is attacked alike by friends within, and foes without the Church; by the former from a not ungrounded fear that the interests of the Church are being sacrificed to the supposed interests of the State; by the latter, partly through jealousy, partly no doubt through a preference for Voluntaryism, or an avowed enmity to Church Establishment altogether.

Another very important question, and one which threatens to become of still greater consequence, arises not so much with regard to the orthodoxy of the established Faith, as to the comprehensiveness of the Establishment. Is the Established Church sufficient for the present crisis? Can it, on the one hand, compre-

hend within it, three schools of such widely different opinions as it at present embraces? Ought it, on the other, to exclude Dissenters, who are clamouring, if not for admission, at any rate for an equal share of State privileges?

The principle on which Dissenters urge their claims, those at least who do not on conscientious grounds advocate the voluntary principle, is the same which was advocated some years ago by Dr. Arnold—that a National Church, if it exist at all, should be so comprehensive as to include the most opposite sects, from Methodists and Presbyterians to Unitarians and Romanists.

The expediency of an Established Church is founded on the mutual aid and assistance which the one should receive from the other: the Church performs certain duties, for which the State guarantees it protection. That the Church has continued her part of the agreement, is evident; but it is not so easy to conjecture what advantage she receives in the present day from the State. Once the State was compelled to receive and adopt the religion of the Church. Till lately certain privileges, if privileges they can be called, such as seats in Parliament and degrees in the Universities, were confined to members of the Established Church. But now all this is changed, and the question of Disestablishment is becoming daily one of serious

and increasing moment to the Church, not from the unreasonable point of view adopted by the Liberationists, but on the contrary from a consideration of her own interests as to whether that connexion can any longer be maintained without great detriment to herself, from the hostile attitude which the State is assuming towards her. The suppression by Parliament of ten Bishoprics at a sweep; the substitution of a Lay in the place of an Ecclesiastical Court of Final Appeal; the legalising, as far as the State can do so, against the plain words of God, of adultery by the Institution of the Divorce Court; the imposition of the Conscience Clause; the Disendowment of the Irish Church; as well as the persistent refusal to the Church of her synodal action:—these, with many others, are grievances of which the Church has to complain, not only as direct acts of violence, but as being unauthorised by Convocation; and therefore in violation of the Constitution.

It is often asserted that the Established Church is a creation of the State for State purposes, for the performance of which the State has bestowed on her certain advantages and endowments; and that if the Church fails in the objects for which she was endowed, or cannot, Proteus like, change the Primitive Faith into a hundred different forms to suit the fancies of the various conflicting sects in the nation,

however numerous they are or however numerous they may become,—then she ceases to be a National Church, and it is the duty, as it is within the power of the State, to reclaim the endowments it bestowed.

It is scarcely possible that a statement such as this, so opposed as it is to the real truth, which is that the State instead of endowing has robbed the Church, can be anything but a wilful misrepresentation of fact; for it cannot be credited that any one would venture an opinion on a subject of such transcendent importance, with respect to which he has not troubled himself to make the least inquiry, and of which he is totally ignorant. The truth, so far from being what these Liberationists adduce, is the very reverse. The endowments of the Church date from the Consecration of Augustine as first Archbishop of Canterbury. At that time large revenues were settled on that See, as well as those of London and Rochester, through the munificence of Ethelbert. About the same time other sees were established by the other kings of the Heptarchy from private sources; and at various later periods these dioceses were divided into parishes commensurate with the estate of the noblemen or squires, by whose liberality Churches were built and endowed upon their different estates. Thus it is clear that the property of the Church is not

only not an endowment of the State, made by the State for State purposes; but that it was originally her independent and inalienable property, in the same sense, and quite as much, as the property of any landowner in the country is his own, and not the State's. It is not therefore easy to comprehend how the payment of tithes can involve hardship or injustice upon Dissenters; for both they and Churchmen alike buy or rent their estates with a full knowledge, and a due consideration of the charge; with a knowledge too that the doctrine which the Clergy of the Church teach is not the doctrine of any Sect, or such doctrine as the State prescribes; but the doctrine of the Catholic Church, as handed down from the earliest age, and summed up in the Creeds and Formularies of the Church. For what other reason could the King be invested with the title of Supreme Head of the Church, except on the ground that it is an Established Church, the interest of which it is his duty to protect? In any other sense than this, the title or exercise of the Royal Supremacy would be simply sacrilegious; for it would arrogate to the monarch the office of Christ; it would constitute him, not a protector, but a maker of laws for the Church; a power which was conferred by Christ on His Apostles and their successors, in the use of which He has promised to protect them to the end of the world.

Another argument for Disestablishment is, with no greater show of reason, adduced by the Liberationists. It is asserted by them that the endowments of the Church having been made before the Reformation, ought to have been restored at that time to the Roman Catholics. To this it must be answered (and it will be shown more fully in another chapter) that Catholicism, and not Roman Catholicism, was always the religion of the Anglican Church, both before and since the Reformation; that the supremacy of Rome was usurped; and that in freeing the Church from that usurped dominion, the Reformation did not introduce any new, but only restored the old Faith, purified from Romish corruptions.

The relation between Church and State, as originally determined, and fairly carried out, contains within it nothing to which Catholics or Protestants, much less Roman Catholics or Protestant Dissenters, could with justice object. The Church, often in violation of her own feelings, has been obliged, in her relation to the State, to perform duties for Dissenters which it would have been impossible for Dissenters to claim, or even expect, under any but an Established Church. The Baptism and education of their children: the solemnization of their marriages: the visitation of their sick: the burial of their dead; and all these for

people who, if the discipline of the Church had been strictly carried out, would have been, *ipso facto*, and were really by their own act excommunicate; these were offices that were performed by the Church for the Dissenters, and which the latter were not backward in claiming as their right;—surely if there was any ground of complaint, or any hardship involved, it was on the part of those who performed, and not on those who received these services.

Yet notwithstanding, the Dissenters were not satisfied, and were always complaining: the State was foolish enough to think that they would be satisfied with compromises, and so from time to time made concessions at the expense of the Church to satisfy, what were represented to be, their conscientious scruples. And now the question from being religious, has become a political one, and is made, both in and out of Parliament, subservient to political ends. The different classes of Liberationists, although as wide apart as the poles in their religious tenets, have become politically a compact body in their opposition to the Church:

> *συνώμοσαν γὰρ, ὄντες ἔχθιστοι τὸ πρίν,*
> *πῦρ καὶ θάλασσα.*

And every day they are growing stronger and bolder, till our statesmen are at last awakening to the fact, that what they have been contending for all along is not part, but the whole;

not some, but the full rights of the Church; and that they will be content with nothing in short, but that which has become a mere matter of time, and which must sooner or later be brought about, viz: Disestablishment; or that which doubtless is still more their object, but which nevertheless, if carried out, would be a direct act of robbing, viz., Disendowment.

Civil and religious liberty are the watchwords of the present day, and grand sounding words they are; but liberty not unfrequently degenerates into licentiousness, and liberty for the State may mean despotism for the Church. Protestants clamour for toleration, and yet experience proves them to be themselves intolerant in the extreme; indeed their idea of toleration seems to come under the definition given by Artemus Ward: "Where every man can enjoy his own religion in peace, and prevent every other person from enjoying his'n." The Creeds and Dogmas of the Church are represented as intolerant. Have Dissenters no modern dogmas of their own? Mr. Vance Smith, one of the special champions of religious liberty, and a staunch advocate for the liberation of religion from State control or patronage, enlightens us on the point in a recent article in the *Contemporary Review*. He instances two sects. The first are the Congregationalists. This body of Christians do not

use Creeds. Instead of these, the builders of their chapels appoint certain trustees or deacons, and issue deeds, by which no stated minister is allowed to maintain his position, who does not "hold, teach, preach, and maintain the doctrine set forth in the schedule." In other words, ministers are always to hold and preach the doctrines held by the founders on pain of dismissal. This is one instance of Protestant liberty.

The other case which he adduces is that of the Wesleyan Methodists. Every candidate for the ministry "before his admission into full connexion, is required to give in the presence of the Conference, a full and explicit declaration of his faith as to the doctrines taught by Mr. Wesley in his first four volumes of sermons and his notes upon the New Testament." A deed containing the Wesleyan doctrine is enrolled in the Court of Chancery, and once every year each minister is questioned as to his adhering to, and preaching the same doctrines. In other words, Wesleyans are not asked as to their belief in the Bible, but in the Bible as preached by John Wesley, a venerable, but it would scarcely be thought, an infallible authority. And yet such a dogma is held as paramount to the "quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus" of the Catholic Church.

Mr. Miall, the great leader of the Libera-

tionists, stigmatizes every Established Church as bearing "the mark of the beast." He has already brought before Parliament, and intends to do so again, a motion for the Disestablishment of the Church. It may not be uninstructive to quote from a Liberal newspaper his opinion of the Established Church in this country. He says: "The Church has risen and worked her way, by internal activity and internal reforms, by energy and by costly sacrifices, and Dissent has not been able to keep up with her. She has become powerful, because she has become useful, and the more she is attacked, the more she seems to assert herself. She leads where before she scarcely durst follow. She is no longer wedded to effete Toryism, for some of her noblest sons in lay and clerical life are found in the ranks of the Liberal party. She has educated the country, while the advocates of Secularism have been standing all the day idle. She has falsified all the predictions of those who feared her destruction as a necessary consequence of her voluntary self-reform. At every turn she has shown her vitality. Church rates were taken away, and forthwith she made up the deficiency by spontaneous offerings. An educational crusade was inaugurated, and so strong was the Church that the ministers of the day could not see their way to any measure destruc-

tive of her work in that useful field." If this is the opinion of an enemy of Establishment, would it be safe, would it be wise in the State to listen to the voice of the same charmer, charm he never so wisely in Parliament, and sever a connection, so fraught with advantage to itself?

But suppose the decree for the Disestablishment of the Church to have gone forth; how is it to be carried out? The question naturally suggests itself: "Is Republicanism in the Church compatible with a Monarchy in the State?" However this may be, it is certain that Disestablishment could not possibly be effected without a violent, possibly a fatal, shock to the Constitution. There is indeed the precedent of the Irish Church; but that bears no analogy to the present question either in its character or its results. The question of the Establishment or Disestablishment of the Irish Church stood entirely on its own merits, and involved only the retention or destruction of a few Acts of Parliament from the beginning of the century to the present time. The Anglo-Catholic Church in Ireland was an exotic, and never carried with it the affections of the people, and lately had dwindled down into a barren Protestantism, numbering very frequently not more than a dozen people in a large parish; and with the exception of its

having an Episcopate and Priesthood, it scarcely presented the slightest traces of Catholicity. To bolster up such an Establishment: to force by the sanction of the State an unmeaning Protestantism upon an unwilling people: to treat Ireland differently to the other parts of the empire, which had been permitted to retain their own religion; to tell her she must accept that form of religion which another part of the State, severed from her by the ocean, had accepted, instead of what she had always professed; such an act of State tyranny could only produce one effect, viz., of disgusting and alienating by an evident act of injustice the feelings of the whole country. In dealing with the Disestablishment of the Irish Church, one mistake was committed, and that was as to Disendowment. The Established Church because it was an injustice, ceased to be; but then her endowments also—for the two Churches of England and Ireland still remain branches of the same Catholic Church—*ought* to have been (we are speaking of *justice*, not of *State necessity*) restored to that from which they had been unjustly alienated, the Roman Catholic religion, which had been all along the religion of the Irish people.

But the Established Church in England, viewed from a political point of view, and being historically coeval with the remotest

antiquity of the country, stands on a wholly different foundation. Of how many Acts of Parliament, from the Heptarchy to the present time, it would involve the destruction: how many wheels within wheels there may be; how much of the superstructure would fall with the destruction of a goodly part of the foundation; who can tell? Many people talk of the connection between Church and State, as if it dated only from the Reformation; or from the time that Henry VIII. arrogated to himself the title of Supreme Head of the Church. But in reality it dates from a much earlier period. From the time of Hildebrand to the time of the Reformation the Popes of Rome had borne the title of Supreme Head of the Universal Church. But, as far as England was concerned, the assumption of that title was an usurpation; and the resumption of it by Henry VIII. was one of the most constitutional acts of that avaricious tyrant; and, as limited by the sanction of Convocation, "quantum per Christi legem licet," and the dictates of common sense, it has acted as one of the strongest barriers of the Constitution. But instead of its dating from the time of Henry VIII. we must seek for its commencement in the Saxon Heptarchy. From the Conquest to the Reformation an oath was taken by the King of England to observe the laws of King Edward;

—"Rex qui vicarius summi regis est, ad hoc est constitutus, ut regnum terrenum et populum Domini, et super omnia sanctum venceretur Ecclesiam Ejus, et regat, et ab injuriosis defendat, et maleficos ab eâ evellat, et destruat et penitus desperdat." Even William the Conqueror, although he started on his conquest with the blessing of the Pope, when he came to the throne was obliged to take the same oath; and, not to multiply authorities, we have the evidence of Chief Justice Coke, as to the antiquity of the Royal Supremacy:—"By the ancient laws of this realm, this kingdom of England is an absolute empire and kingdom, consisting of one Head, which is the King; . . . the clergy and laity, both of them, next and immediately under God; subject and obedient to the Head."

Such is the connexion between Church and State in the land, and such its antiquity; ought it to be lightly, can it be easily, dissevered? It is a political rather than a ecclesiastical question. What would be the full consequences of Disestablishment to the State it is difficult to foretell. It is the duty of our Statesmen to look to it.

The position of the Church of England is unique either in the ancient or modern history of the world. To it belong the Colleges of our two Universities, as well as the Univer-

sities themselves; for in the foundation of these, there was always one principle and one condition laid down, that they should be in connexion with the established religion of the land.

The connexion between Church and State also ensures a body of clergy holding a different position from the parish priests of any other country. Such is their birth and education that they are the equals of the squire; whilst such is their profession, that they are the friends of the poorest in the parish. What could the Liberationists substitute for the advantages which rich and poor alike enjoy from an Established Church? A voluntary system sounds well in theory; but how would it answer in our rural districts, and amongst our poorer population?

At the present time there are in England, Wales, and Scotland, something like one hundred and fifty thousand parishes. In each of these parishes there is one, in many, several parish priests, whose duty it is, besides their public ministrations, to attend to the temporal as well as spiritual wants of the poorer classes; to visit them in sickness, to counsel them in health, and superintend the education of their children. When it is remembered that there are more than one million nine hundred thousand children attending the Church's schools; that the Church has in the last quarter of a

century spent seventy millions on building churches, parsonages, and schools, surely we should hesitate before we abandon such advantages to the clamour of a noisy minority, or an unnatural alliance of heterogeneous Dissenters, combined only, through jealousy or discontent, for the destruction of the Established Church.

It is said that the Catholic, or rather the Ritualistic party, within the Church are desirous to promote Disestablishment. What are the real facts, and what is the position of the Catholic party with regard to the Establishment? As far as the endowments of the Church go, or their own interests are concerned it matters to them but little; they have had but scanty justice meted out to them; nor up to the present time has one of their party been advanced to the highest positions in the Church. Of injustice they have had enough and to spare. But for the sake of the advantages which the Established Church has hitherto, and still might confer upon the State, they would maintain the connexion in its integrity. But the safety of the Church in the present day depends upon the Catholic party; for whilst one party is impotent to act, and another openly sides with Erastianism; it devolves upon the Catholic party to take care lest the State impose upon the Church conditions which when once lawlessly legalized they could not alter,

and with which it would be impossible to comply.

Nothing yet has been done which is past remedy. But even now trouble is near at hand, and worse than Disestablishment threatens us. Even now there is a cry for the mutilation or expungment of the Athanasian Creed, and that agitation is openly encouraged by two Archbishops. Even now a Bill, once rejected, is again to be brought before Parliament to entitle Dissenters to officiate in our consecrated churchyards; a Bill, which, if once it become law, will be a stepping-stone to what must too surely follow—their officiating in our Churches. At such a time, there can be no question that the friends of the Church must gird about their loins, and stand out, if necessary, for Disestablishment, even if the property of the Church should sacrilegiously be confiscated with it; the connexion between Church and State which has worked well for so many centuries must be snapped asunder;—but we must not shut our eyes to the consequences: the Church will rise up more glorious than ever on the ashes of her former self; but the State will suffer; and,—a matter which will come home to Dissenters,—their own property will suffer; the Bishops will be excluded from the House of Lords; but with that exclu-

sion will certainly follow another catastrophe, viz., the fall of the Monarchy; for the aphorism of King James is as applicable to our times as it was to his; "no Bishop, no King."

Chapter II.

PROTESTANTISM.

THE three different sections, we might almost say the three different religions, within the Established Church, may severally be designated as Protestantism, Catholicism, and Rationalism; or as they are not uncommonly called, Low Church, High Church, and Broad Church. But as Protestantism, although not the oldest, nor the true Reformed Faith of the Church, is that which in the minds of many persons expresses the religion of England, it may be as well to take that section first in order, and to examine into its history, its rise and progress, to the time that through its own internal dissensions, and inability to satisfy the increasing intelligence of the day, it became effete, and almost ceased to exist except in name.

If the object of language be to conceal thought, and to give a wrong idea of things, the name of Protestantism in England is happily chosen; because so far from conveying any clear information as to what it is, it de-

clares itself to be the very thing it is not. Had the party who have chosen this appellation called themselves Zuinglians or Calvinists, the name would at least have been intelligible; but why they should call themselves Protestants or Lutherans, it is somewhat difficult to conjecture.

It is almost impossible to define what a Protestant is. Dr. Arnold describes an Evangelical as "a good Christian with a low understanding, a bad education and ignorance of the world;" whilst he speaks of his infinitely little mind, disputing about anise and cummin. To this definition of himself, however, perhaps a Protestant would object.

Even if a Protestant were asked what Protestantism is, he could give no answer, for the simple reason that Protestantism is nothing. If he were asked whence the name came, he could answer that it came from the Diet of Spires; if he were asked again whether he agreed in the doctrine of those from whom the name is borrowed, he would readily confess that the Lutheran doctrine of Consubstantiation was as little to his mind as the Romish doctrine of Transubstantiation.

Or, if we bring the same person into court again, and ask him what the doctrines of Protestantism are, he will be able to give you an answer, but that answer will be of the same

negative character. He would comprise its doctrine in three words: "Justification by Faith;" and he would perhaps refer you to the 11th Article: "that we are justified by faith only is a most wholsome doctrine." But what this Justifying Faith is, how it is obtained, or how it shows itself, does not enter into his Creed. If you ask him, how he knows he has Faith, he will answer, "because he does know it;" or perhaps, "because he feels it."

Now in the Article above alluded to, there is nothing which, if properly understood, countenances such an interpretation of Faith. The Article does not say what Faith is. But it is evident that the Faith spoken of, must be one of two things, living or dead. A dead Faith cannot justify, therefore it must be a living Faith that is meant; in a word, the Faith spoken of in the Bible, that shows itself by works; for "without works Faith is dead."

How such a party came to exist, and for many years to exercise supremacy in a Church of such opposite principles, it is not difficult to determine. It is clear that from the first, there was a marked and radical distinction between the English and the Continental Reformation. In England the object was to retain Catholicism, on the Continent to destroy it. But there was a party in England who differed widely from the principle on which the English

Reformation was carried out; to the Ritual, the vestments, and many other matters; and complained that the Reformation did not proceed to the same lengths as the Reformed Churches on the Continent. These persons took to themselves the name of Puritans, and showed the purity of their religion by the murder of an archbishop and their king. Their legitimate and lineal descendants, almost in an unbroken line, are the Protestants of the present day; who, like the Puritans, object to the authority and doctrines of the Church, Baptismal Regeneration, the Real Presence in the Holy Eucharist, to the daily service, and to the general observance of the Rubrics; and although these things are clearly enjoined by the Formularies of the Church, and their disbelief or non-observance is due to the state of lethargy and degradation, which during, and in consequence of the Protestant supremacy, had crept into and wellnigh extinguished the Church; yet now-a-days claim that from custom, which is another word for Protestant laziness and neglect in former days, the law is on their side; and not only do they claim custom as their excuse, but they raise money for the purpose of persecuting those who do not hold that a bad custom ought to override law and Catholic usage; who because they have sworn to do certain things, think an oath ought to be observed; who be-

lieve that the doctrines taught by the Apostles, as interpreted by those who either conversed with them, or were their immediate successors, are more likely to be Scriptural and true, than the opinions of Luther, Calvin, Huss, or Peter Martyr; and who, because they have undoubted proof that the Reformed Church of England is Catholic, do not intend to commit it again to the tender mercies of the Protestants, or to the darkness and immorality of the eighteenth century.

Still, it cannot be denied that although the object of the English Reformation was not to destroy, but to revive, Catholicism, not to establish any new religion, but to purify the Church from the corruptions of Rome; yet from the Revolution to within the last forty years Protestantism has enjoyed a supreme and almost undisputed sway in England; that it gained such influence that, although the word is never once used in the Prayer Books, Homilies, Canons, or Articles, from being the name of a party, it became applied to the whole Anglican Church.

And what was the consequence of this long reign of Protestantism? Surely never was religion at a lower ebb than it was in this country during the latter part of the seventeenth, and the eighteenth centuries. The Church became split up into a number of differ-

ent sects of Dissenters, not from dislike to the Church's doctrine (for of this, they had little opportunity of judging), but in consequence of the universal deadness that pervaded the religion of the day, and the immorality that resulted from it. Nothing could have been better devised than the system which our forefathers had adopted for the continuance and efficacy of the Church. They had built magnificent cathedrals and churches; to be the possessor of this world's good and owner of an estate, was in those days regarded as a trust received from God, and to carry with it duties and responsibilities; parishes were commensurate with estates; and in each parish was built a church worthy of the glory of God, and a charge made upon the property as a support for the clergy for ever. Heresy and schism were then regarded as sins, not only to be deprecated, as they are in our days, by unmeaning lips; and little provision was taken against a time when so far from being regarded as sins, they would be considered a reasonable objection against the payment of tithes, and the support of those very churches which their founders' zeal and piety had created.

Thus were our Churches founded, and a suitable provision made for their maintenance, and the support of the clergy, by the liberality of our forefathers. But under Protestant

ascendancy everything became changed. The zeal of our ancestors had departed. A new kind of landowners arose, who spent their time in gambling, luxury, and not unfrequently in dissipation; no new churches were built to meet the requirements of the increasing population; the clergy were not sufficiently numerous, and had become too idle to superintend the spiritual wants of the people. Let any one compare the number of churches in the east and west of London; how few in comparison with the population, how dissimilar, how inferior in architecture are the latter with respect to the former; how mean, almost without exception, until the Catholic revival of late years, were the plastered, whitewashed houses erected for the worship of God, compared with the costly mansions of the rich who crowd that luxurious neighbourhood. A comparison has been somewhere made between one of our old cathedral towns, Gloucester, and a fashionable watering place of modern date, Cheltenham; and it was found, not many years ago, when the population was equal, that the Church accommodation in the former as compared with that of the latter town, was ten to one. And this was at a time when wealth was accumulating in England to an unprecedented extent; small villages were growing into large towns; the immense spread of commerce was changing

the whole face of the country, and the character of the people; yet scarcely any church accommodation was supplied for the increasing population. Three hundred years ago, Lancashire was a rural and thinly populated county; it was destined to become the centre of the great manufacturing industry of England; yet notwithstanding the immense influx of population, until this century scarcely an additional church had been built to accommodate its overflowing multitudes.

And if matters were so with regard to Church accommodation, the condition of the clergy was no less deplorable. George Fox, the founder of the Quakers, relates how that being troubled in conscience, he sought for comfort and counsel from two parish priests; one of whom advised him to have recourse to tobacco and psalm singing; whilst the other recommended bleeding as the cure for his spiritual maladies. Perhaps to this incident in his life may be ascribed the origin of Quakerism. The description given by Macaulay of the clergy of that time, though no doubt exaggerated, is familiar to every one. As a profession, the Priesthood was in every way inferior to that which existed before the Reformation. A servant girl was considered no unsuitable match as the parson's wife; and the family inherited the social position of the mother, the boys following the plough, the

daughters going into service. Meanwhile the parson himself obtained his livelihood by feeding swine, loading dung-carts, and by general work upon the glebe; and on holidays and great occasions he was admitted into the kitchen at the great house, and regaled with cold meat and ale amongst the servants.

Such a picture as the above is no doubt overdrawn; but at any rate the vicar and the publican were not unfrequently staunch allies; and if the former was by chance in the parish, which was rarely the case, it was a common practice to search for him, not in the parsonage, but in the public-house. But as a matter of fact, the parson scarcely ever was in his own parish. It was no unusual thing for a clergyman to hold three or four livings together, with perhaps a Canonry in addition; and if he appeared now and then on a Sunday in one or other of his different livings, or supplied one service through a substitute—hence the origin and meaning of the word curate, as the person who really had the care of the parish—it was as much as could be expected of him, or at any rate as much as others did. The well-known cartoon of Hogarth presents itself to one's mind;—a poor wretch is being taken to execution, the Chaplain following behind in a Hackney-coach: whilst a stranger, supposed to be John Wesley, is seated by his side, exhorting

him to repentance. An author of one of the "Essays and Reviews" characterises this period in the Church's history as one of "decay of religion, licentiousness of morals, public corruption, profaneness of language, a day of rebuke and blasphemy." What wonder, when there were no clergymen to attend them, and when no adequate Church accommodation was afforded, Dissenters built chapels and established services of their own, not from any dislike to the Church's doctrine, but from sheer necessity?

And yet Protestantism was the sole religion of the State. Every vestige of Catholicism had disappeared. It may appear somewhat paradoxical, considering the vice that prevailed both amongst clergy and laity, that the Protestantism of the day was considered to be eminently respectable. True, the churches were shut for six days out of seven, and opened, sometimes only for Even-song, on Sunday; the Holy Eucharist was celebrated at most once a quarter, in many churches only once a year. But then it was the religion of the upper classes. The squire lived at the great house; and whilst his eldest son was to succeed him in the estate, and the fool of the family was sent into the army, a third was Rector of the parish; and the baptisms and burials, and marriages were all solemnized by him; and so the poor looked up to him, not indeed with respect, but with awe and

admiration, as being the squire's son; and if he came amongst them now and then, and preached them an occasional sermon from the parish pulpit, they considered this was as much as could be expected from so great a man.

Such then was Protestantism in this country at the commencement and towards the middle of the eighteenth century; truly "the salt had lost its savour." And when it seemed that nothing short of a miracle could arouse the nation from its spiritual apathy; just when the Established Church had sunk to the lowest depth of degradation; a man was raised up equal to the occasion. That man was John Wesley: one who was said at the time to have more influence than the whole Bench of Bishops, but who from his enthusiasm, so in contrast was it to the habitual indifference of the day, was ridiculed as a Methodist or a bigoted Dissenter. But Wesley was no Dissenter, in the modern acceptation of the term; had he lived in the present day, he would have taken his stand amongst the Catholics; nay, his strict enforcement of discipline; his advocacy of clerical celibacy; the severe austerity to which he accustomed himself; the system of Confession which he advocated and adopted; all these, which were habitual to him, and which he openly inculcated, would have subjected him to the imputation of being a Romanist. Wesley, and the

Methodists, as his followers were designated, however widely we may differ from them, were the very persons required in the Church's need. Their rise in the eighteenth century has been not inaptly compared to that of the Dominicans and Franciscans in the thirteenth century. They found a coldness and deadness in religion prevailing everywhere. The sermons of the day, "polished as marble, but also as lifeless and as cold," were dull moral essays, appealing to the understanding instead of to the heart; deep arguments in proof of the Immortality of the soul, and the Eternity of future punishment; awful even in their orthodoxy. Wesley saw the need, and seized his opportunity. He and his followers preached from the pulpits sermons appealing to the hearts, instead of essays to the intellects, of his hearers. They visited them from house to house. Whilst the parish churches were closed, the meeting houses were thrown open every evening; thither flocked by hundreds the people who had been before accustomed to spend their evenings in the public-houses. The great success the Wesleyans met with was owing to the marked contrast of their preaching to the religion of the day. They preached against drunkenness, idleness, and dissipation, and dwelt upon practical truths, which in those days, little as we can understand it now, were unu-

sual subjects for sermons; and they proved to their hearers, not only that religion could make them better, but also happier and richer men, than the public-houses, and profligate amusements, and mis-spent Sundays.

The history of the Church, like the early history of mankind, is a succession of declines and falls from a higher to a lower standard; and then in the darkest hour, and in the time of greatest need, some one, almost miraculously, is raised up equal to the emergency. In no respect, more than in this, does history so frequently repeat itself. And so it was with regard to the Church in the last century. And it was Wesley, humanly speaking, who kept religion from altogether dying out in England.

The Anglican Church has the unfortunate characteristic of not discovering the worth of her most valuable sons before their death; or if she does, of worrying them beyond her pale. Examples of this in our own day are familiar to everybody. In any Church, except our own under Protestant ascendancy, such a man as Wesley would have been raised to the high places in the Church; as it is, through his zeal his life was frequently endangered, he was branded as a Methodist, and his successors driven into schism.

When we reflect upon the corruptions that pervaded the Church, as well as all classes of

society in England during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries; the unwillingness of Protestantism to reform itself; its bigotry and intolerance towards such a man as Wesley, we cannot wonder at the words of Lord Macaulay: "For these two hundred and fifty years," he says, "Protestantism had made no conquests worth speaking of;" whilst during the same period "the Church of Rome, having lost a large part of Europe, not only ceased to lose, but actually regained nearly half of what she had lost."

Lord Macaulay is here speaking not of England only, but of Europe in general. And if we look into its history in other countries, we find the existence of Protestantism attended with the same results. Thus in Germany, not many years ago the Protestanten-Verein (a society somewhat corresponding to the Protestant Association, *without the persecution*) was established for the promotion of pure religion, and was intended as a go-between,—between Lutheranism on the one hand and open Infidelity on the other. Its professed object was not to revive Theology, but to revive and remodel, and bring religion into accord with the intellectual development of the day. Like all Protestant Institutions, it was distinct enough in what it repudiated; it rejected all Theological systems, Ultramontanism, the Hierarchy, and

all existing dogmatism; its protesting part was explicit and intelligible enough; but it failed, simply for the reason that Protestantism always does and must fail, because it substituted no dogmatic teaching of its own, and whilst giving a full programme of what it disbelieved, it affirmed nothing as to what it believed. Hence in a short time, this Verein which was meant to counteract Infidelity, had so far advanced in Rationalism, that Ecclesiastical buildings were refused it by the State, and it was obliged to hold its meetings, at which open Infidelity came in time to be advocated, in a Gymnasium.

In Germany, Protestantism has been the fruitful parent of all the Rationalism, Infidelity, and Atheism that so widely pervade that country. And yet that which we call Protestantism in England is in Germany an exotic, as it is in England. The Reformed religion in that country was Lutheranism, but Zuingle entered in and introduced Calvinism, and the Established Religion in the present day is a compromise between Lutheranism and Calvinism. A correspondent of the *Times* writing from Berlin in 1869, states that the only religion in Germany is to be found amongst the Lutherans and Romanists, whilst three-fourths of the educated populace he stigmatises as "unbelieving Protestants."

Protestantism has made its way into many countries; it cannot be denied that for a time it has done much good; but it always fails in the end; it makes conquests for a time, but as Lord Macaulay has said in the passage above quoted, after a time Rome not only ceases to lose, but recovers nearly half of her losses. We need not inquire far for the cause of this. It is because Protestantism teaches no objective truth; because it is simply a religion of the feeling, that it has broken down entirely; that in these times of increasing knowledge, thoughtful minds have been driven to examine their position, and so Protestantism has resolved itself into two parties, the one holding to Catholicism, the other to the teaching of Strauss. The latter is the logical result of its teaching; the former is the antidote which the Church of England, through her revived Ritual, is trying to establish. The right of private judgment, must always fail, or it must end in Rationalism. Clarendon remarks that the right of private judgment is equally dangerous to the State as to the Church; "a proud and venomous dislike against discipline of the Church of England and so by degrees (as the progress is very natural) an equal irreverence to the government of the State too."

If Protestantism is to be the religion of England, and every one is to interpret Scrip-

ture according to his own peculiar views, we need have no Priesthood and no Church, for every one may be a Church to himself. We can have no definite Faith; for as different men, and even as the same men at different times, come to different and conflicting opinions as to the same Scriptures; nay as Protestantism itself interprets the same passage in a hundred different ways, and so is broken up into a hundred different sects, how is it possible, amid all these varieties, there can be any uniform religion, or any uniform teaching, or, in fact, any Church at all? No: Protestantism has failed and has wellnigh died out; it cannot supply the spiritual requirements of the day. Man asks for bread, and it gives him a stone.

Chapter III.

CATHOLICISM.

THE rise and spread of Wesleyism in the eighteenth century produced a new era in the history of Protestantism. Whether as a direct consequence of that movement, or owing to the alarm created through Europe by the reign of infidelity in France at the end of the last century, certain it is that religion in England revived and put forth new strength. But henceforward a spirit of Calvinism was infused into the teaching of Protestantism. Up to this time its teaching had been of the high and dry type; unpractical, but not on the whole unorthodox. It is true that shortly after the Reformation a contest had ensued between the Reformed Faith and the tenets of the Puritan, and the Puritans had won the day. But again the Caroline divines brought back the Church to its primitive Faith; and from that time forward through the seventeenth to the middle of the eighteenth century, the teaching of the Church, if teaching it could be called, through all the ignorance that prevailed, bore the impress

that was reshaped upon it by the Bishops who adorned the Church during the reign of Charles II., and was not so much a denial of doctrine, as a blind worship of the principles of the Reformation, and a systematic abuse of Rome. The Protestantism of that day, was, what may be considered, of the High Church type. The Church of England, as the Established Church of the land, was regarded as too respectable an institution to admit of strange doctrine, or the possibility of rival sects. An unquestioning adherence to her doctrines, notwithstanding the almost universal ignorance as to what those doctrines meant, existed; and any deviation from what was supposed to be orthodox, or any introduction at variance with the Conservatism that prevailed, would have been at once condemned. It was this religious Conservatism of the time, and a repugnance to any change, however desirable, that urged on the bishops and clergy in their opposition to Wesley, and which ultimately succeeded in alienating him and his followers from the Church, of which they would probably otherwise have remained as faithful and useful members to the present day.

But, from whatever cause, Protestantism at the end of the last and the beginning of the present century revived. A band of zealous men arose within the Church. But now the

doctrine of the liturgy: the efficacy of the Sacraments; the authority of the Church: and the Apostolical succession were impugned. Sermons were regarded as the all important part of the service; the necessity of sudden Conversion: Justification by Faith without works: an Invisible instead of a Visible Church; the Sabbatical observance of Sunday; were the doctrines chiefly, if not wholly, inculcated. Religion became a thing of terror: Hell, not Heaven, was the almost invariable subject chosen for the pulpit.

But we must confess with gratitude a reaction of any kind from the cold religion of the two previous centuries: nor can we forget such names as those of Wilberforce, Venn, and Simeon, and the philanthropic zeal which they displayed, in overcoming the difficulties with which they had to contend against the almost heathen ignorance of the day. In England there can be only one feeling of love and reverence, for the memory of a man who devoted his life to the removal of that plague-spot of modern times, the slave trade. Nor can we forget that to these men and their followers is due the establishment of several societies, such as the Church Missionary, the Pastoral Aid, and Bible Societies; societies from which, although we may differ from them in many, and those very important points, we

would not detract, nor deny their usefulness, and the pious intentions of their founders.

But here our praise must end. Protestantism soon relapsed into its old narrowness and formality; it failed to hold its own against the improved education and increasing intellect of the day, and thoughtful minds began to see that the result of its teaching must lead either to Antinomianism on the one hand, or to Rationalism on the other.

But a reaction of a different and more permanent kind than that under Wesley was at hand, just at the timewhen some revivals was most needed. It is almost impossible to overstate the evil condition into which the Church had relapsed, when the "Tracts for the Times" made their first appearance in 1833. The Churches were shut all the week except on Sunday: daily Prayer was systematically neglected; the Holy Eucharist at most was celebrated four times a year. The Churches were disfigured with plastered walls, uneven floors, and unsightly galleries; Holy Baptism was administered from a basin, whilst the font, the receptacle of hats and umbrellas, was otherwise disused, and was dirty and mildewed; the Altar instead of the re-Table and the two Candlesticks, was the usual repository of the tallow candle and the utensils for cleaning the church. Credence Tables were never seen, and

seldom heard of; the elements were put on the Altar at an unauthorised time; the Church Militant Prayer was never used except at the infrequent Celebrations; Prayers, which contained points of doctrine, especially in the Baptismal office, were omitted; the use of the black gown in the pulpit in memory of Geneva, was universal; the Holy Sacrament was administered to a rail-full of communicants at a time; pews more fitted for sleeping or jesting than praying, were substituted for open seats, to the benefit of the rich and the exclusion of the poor, and, unless their owners were present, were kept religiously locked against intruders. The services, without the responses of the congregation, were conducted in a duet between the parson and the clerk. In addition to those, there were all the evils that existed among the clergy before Wesley came and aroused them; the prevalence of sinecures: bishops holding two or three valuable pieces of preferment with a deanery or so in addition, and so amassing large fortunes; the same clergy holding several livings, and rarely seen by their parishioners except on Sundays, and frequently not even then.

To this we must add the increasing jealousy of the State towards the Church. The Reform Bill had been passed: the Liberal party, which for nearly fifty years had been out of office

had just assumed the reins of government, and immediately set themselves to Church reform, or, in other words, to the benefit of the Dissenters at the expense of the Church; and a commencement had already been made by the suppression and confiscation of the Irish Bishoprics. And this oppression by the State was viewed with general indifference, or even satisfaction, *without* the Church; whilst *within* the Church, false doctrines were preached, and no voice was raised against them. There was no religion in the land that deserved the name; or what little there was was amongst the Dissenters; the Church had no influence, and no authority; and the time had come when a mere passive, subjective Protestantism could be tolerated no longer without the greatest danger both to the Church and State.

It is necessary to bear in mind the general apathy and indifference that pervaded the Church at this time, in order to make a fair estimate of the change which the Catholic revival effected. We of the present generation live under a different order of things; and it is difficult to realize that only forty years ago the state of things was so corrupt; and when we hear Catholics abused, we forget that it was through their labour, and self-denial, and persecution, that the improvements which we see in our days were effected; that they have

laboured, and that we enjoy the fruit of their labour.

That the evil which we have described existed, there can be no doubt, even in the minds of the staunchest Protestants. That some remedy was necessary, if the Church in this country was to continue, was evident; the question was as to the nature of the remedy.

It was felt that the Anglican formularies recognised the principles of Catholicism against the Protestant principles which had so long prevailed, and that Catholic not Protestant doctrines were the doctrines of the Prayer Book. The Lectures of Dr. Lloyd, at that time Regius Professor of Divinity, afterwards Bishop of Oxford, had led men to the study of Catholic theology. A body of learned men had arisen in the University who made the writings of the Fathers, Ecclesiastical History, and Ancient Liturgies their study. A meeting of clergy was held at Hadley in Suffolk. The question arose as to what must be done to meet the State opposition, and the Latitudinarian tendencies of the day.

It was agreed that the Church contained within herself—if her own system could be properly developed and fruitfully carried out—the necessary elements of reform. No violent agitation like that of Wesley in the last, or the Reformation in the sixteenth century, was re-

quired. If the Church would only be faithful to herself; if the members could be brought to believe that she was a true branch of the Catholic Church; that not preaching, but Sacraments; not Dissent but an Apostolic Ministry; not the Bible, as privately interpreted, but as received by the Church throughout all ages, were the channels divinely appointed as the ordinary means for conveying Grace; if they could be brought back to the belief that the Church in which they were baptized was founded, not on the Reformation, nor on Calvin, or Wesley, but on the Apostles and Prophets, and would receive the Church's instead of man's teaching, even then all might be well.

Such was the feeling that produced the renaissance of Catholicism in England. To promote the object desired a plan was devised for circulating some short Tracts, "with the object of contributing something towards the practical revival of doctrines, which although held by the great divines of our Church, at present have become obsolete with the majority of her members, and are withdrawn from public view, even by the more learned and orthodox few who still adhere to them." Hence these Tracts were called "Tracts for the Times:" and the authors Tractarians, a name which afterwards, together with that of Pusey-

ites, became attached to their followers; and which though doubtless first applied to them in scorn, is, as being identical with that of Catholics, really one of respect and honour.

Even in the present day a pious horror is excited in the minds of certain members of the Church—chiefly old ladies and half-pay officers —(why it should be so with the latter is not obvious, but still the fact exists) at the bare mention of Catholicism being taught in the Church of England. That this should be so with careless and irreligious persons is not surprising, for Catholicism is real, and they hate religion that tells them of their faults. But it is true also with regard to religious people; any Dissenting eccentricities, any Protestant supineness, nay the rapid spread of Colensoism, does not alarm them so much as the prevalence of Catholicism, even though they are constrained to confess it is doing a good work. It is difficult to explain this. In some minds there is a confusion no doubt between Catholicism and Roman Catholicism, and everything horrible connected with Rome, the Inquisition, the massacre of the Huguenots, the Gunpowder Plot, and other enormities, rushes back upon them.

And yet the system advocated now is the system which the Church of England held and taught long before the errors of the Church of Rome were introduced, viz., Catholicism. The

sole foundation of the Catholic revival is the Bible. But the Bible is a large book, and contains some truths simple and easy to understand; but it contains on the other hand, truths which the highest intellect cannot comprehend. And so the Bible has been variously interpreted; the Protestant interprets it according to each man's judgment, which is tantamount to a confession that there is no such thing as abstract truth; that Divine truth is only what "each man troweth." The Rationalist on the other hand, following in the steps of the Protestant right of private judgment, interprets the Bible according to each man's reason; in other words he brings down the Divine Intellect to a par with the human intellect. These two systems are modern. But Catholicism is the same which has existed from the Apostles' time to the present day. It is the interpretation of the Bible and of the teaching of the Apostles, according to those who lived nearest the Apostles' time, some of whom as S. Ignatius and Polycarp, were contemporary with and had conversed with S. John. The evidence of such witnesses is invaluable. Ignatius bore the name of Theophorus, which may mean either "carrying God," or as S. Jerome explains it, "carried by God;" and is said to be the Child whom our Saviour set in the midst of the disciples, and whom He took in

His arms. Irenæus, the pupil of Polycarp, asserts that the latter was taught by the disciples, and especially S. John, with whom he had familiar intercourse. Eusebius speaks of his familiar intercourse with S. John, and he speaks also of Polycarp's intercourse with others who had seen the Lord; whilst Tertullian says that he was ordained Bishop of Smyrna by S. John himself. Thus we have a connecting link between the first and second centuries.

Now according to our ordinary custom, the principle of Catholicism is plain and reasonable. Who is so likely to understand the mind and teaching of another as his contemporary, who enjoyed his acquaintance, who has often conversed with him, was perhaps his own familiar friend? And here lies the great and all important difference between Anglo-Catholicism, and Roman Catholicism. The latter at the farthest goes back to the Middle Ages. But Anglo-Catholicism, for the interpretation of doubtful meaning of Scripture, resorts to those who were the immediate successors of the Apostles; to the doctrine and ritual of the Primitive Church; of the three Creeds, parts of which were derived immediately from, or contained the undoubted teaching of the Apostles; to the first four General Councils, as being nearest the Apostolic times, which were

held when the Catholic Church was one and undivided, and before the introduction of doctrinal error and mediæval superstition.

Such a principle as this is intelligible; does it not also commend itself as reasonable, as being the only one which has a fixed and unchanging foundation? Protestantism, according to the varieties of private judgment, is broken up into numberless sects, each maintaining distinct doctrines. Rationalism has foundered and made shipwreck of the Faith on the shoals of Infidelity, Atheism, or Pantheism, which must in time, unless subjected to Catholicism, sap the foundation, not only of religion, but of society at large; and yet Catholicism, not Roman Catholicism (for at present the two are distinct), is the one unchanging religion from the Apostles' time until now. Errors had crept into it; Romanists had added to, Protestants detracted from, the Faith. To bring back the Faith to its original simplicity; to carry out the Reformation according to the spirit of the Church's formularies; to restore the study of the early Fathers to an acquaintance with our Caroline Divines; this was the object of the Catholic Revival.

The task required no ordinary zeal and learning. But those who had undertaken it were equal to the work. The "Tracts for the Times" followed each other in quick succession;

some Catenæ Patrum were published: men began to inquire and read for themselves; the knowledge of theology revived; primitive teaching was allowed to be the undoubted spirit of our formularies; and by degrees, notwithstanding much opposition, a general desire for a better and more ecclesiastical order of things was established. New churches were built; old ones were restored; the revival of Gothic Architecture gave an ecclesiastical character to the new churches; mutilated or hidden pieces of architecture were brought to light; mildewed fonts were cleansed and restored to their original use; decent church music revived; daily Matins and Evensong and frequent celebrations were re-established; in one word, life and order took the place of darkness and confusion.

It has been said that no religious change, however desirable, ever takes place without meeting with the opposition of the University of Oxford. It is needless therefore to say that the movement met with persistent opposition in that seat of learning. But it is strange, except that such in England, where so strong an aversion always has existed to religious changes of any kind, is universally the case, a revival so desirable in place of the utter recklessness that had previously prevailed, should have met with anything but gratitude and enthusiasm. But

so it was. We need not enter into the nature of the opposition. No doubt Bishops and Priests disliked having their shortcomings brought to light; the former objected to being told that £20,000 a year was not of the essence of the Episcopate, nor an imitation of the poverty and self-denial of the Apostles; the latter that pluralities and sinecures were illegal. These things perhaps were natural. But it is strange that people should have preferred to live in ignorance, with the sword of ungodliness and infidelity hanging over their heads, which, unless turned aside, might fall at any moment. Yet this also was so.

It was acknowledged, that contemporaneously with the spread of the Tracts, an extensive increase of religious feeling ensued amongst the higher and middle classes; it was admitted there were more Services and a larger attendance at those Services; that Sunday was not profaned as formerly; that profligate amusements had decreased; that there was a great increase of religious literature; and a general spread of religion over the whole face of society. Yet the authors of a change so beneficial were persecuted; the observance of the plainest directions of the Church; the doctrines of Baptismal Regeneration, of the Apostolical Succession, of Confession, and Absolution, although it was not denied that they were the

language of the Prayer Book, were stigmatised as Romish, and their authors as unfaithful; not because they violated the Church's teaching, but because they wished to revive the Church's action in the Church's way, through the revival of her discipline, her synods, and her convocations.

But the effect of the movement became more evident as time went on. A great change had been effected in the ritual of the Church; the Press, a most reluctant witness, bore evidence to a still more important change in social and domestic life. The coarseness and levity of manner, which had been the prevailing tone of the day, was not only discountenanced, but entirely excluded from society. A great moral and intellectual improvement was observable through all ranks and ages from the highest to the lowest. And the improvement was especially manifest among the young; henceforward not the advantages of birth, so much as a high standard of religious education, was the distinguishing feature of an English gentleman. People who regarded the movement with no great affection, were obliged to confess that it was the most important in any country since the Restoration. One of the writers in "Essays and Reviews" goes so far as to state that "the commencement of the 'Tracts of the Times' marked the fall of Rationalism." (This perhaps

may account for the fact that one of the writers in that book was one of the four Tutors who objected to the publication of the Tracts.) We cannot indeed accept this statement as to the fall of Rationalism—it has at any rate assumed no insignificant proportions in our days—but it may be asserted with confidence that if the further spread of Rationalism, or Infidelity, or Atheism which have disgraced other countries is to be kept under in England, it can only be by the assertion of Catholic doctrine, and the thorough development of the Church's system.

And there is another great benefit which the Catholic revival has conferred upon the Church, and which its opponents will not be loath to acknowledge; viz., it has improved, at least outwardly, Protestantism. True, Protestants are as bigoted and persecuting as ever, a circumstance which for their own sake we must deplore; but which has been, as persecution always is, an unmixed good to those against whom their persecution was directed. "One more such victory and we are undone;" exclaimed a Church-associanist of one of these Cadmean victories. But *outwardly* Protestantism has improved through the impetus given it by Catholicism. Witness its increased services: the more frequent observance of Saint's Days; the occasionally early Celebrations; the improved Church music; the introduction of

Hymns Ancient and Modern in place of Tait and Brady; the Surpliced Choir: the Church Militant Prayer, and the Offertory; Baptisms after the second Lesson; all these are improvements, and although each of them in turn attacked when their use was first revived by Catholics, have since been adopted, and are a debt of gratitude which Protestants owe to Catholics.

It is said that Catholic services are attended almost solely by women. But this is untrue, and in this respect Catholicism in England presents a marked contrast to religion on the Continent: men do attend the services, and young men too, in no insignificant number, as any one can see and judge for himself, if he takes the trouble. But whilst men have their business to attend to, is it not a cause of thankfulness if the Church affords an asylum to the afflicted ones, to the fatherless children and widows; to those who through trouble, or poverty, or loss of friends, have no other earthly source, except their Church from whence to look for comfort; to all (and of those the larger proportion must be women) who can devote their time to God, without diminishing aught of their domestic duties? How many could bear witness to the great blessings the Catholic Church in this country—the daily services, the frequent celebrations, the Priestly

comfort and Absolution—have so often afforded them?

Let no one be deceived by unmeaning cries that Catholicism is leagued with Romanism. Whoever believes this, let him ask himself this question; why is the Catholic movement so abused by Romanists? The answer is plain; whilst conversions from Rome to Catholicism are frequent, conversions from Catholicism to Rome in the present day are almost unknown. Romanists hate and abuse Catholicism because they fear it; because they know that as long as Protestantism holds undisputed sway, so long Rome will make numerous converts in England; because they know that the Catholic Party, now that they have laid claim to as their birthright, and put forth in their services, all the beauty of holiness, present an impassable barrier to Romanism, for the obvious reason, which we cannot too often repeat, that whilst the Catholicism of the Anglican Church is primitive and Apostolic, Roman Catholicism is to a great extent modern, and so far opposed to the doctrines of the One, Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Church.

Chapter IV.

RITUALISM.

THAT the work done, or rather commenced by the Tractarians, was most important, and attended with the most beneficial results, there can be no question. But it could not be expected that Catholic teaching, however good, or the mere saying of the Church's services, were sufficient of themselves, to bring back the masses of the population, who through a long system of neglect, had fallen into Rationalism or Dissent. Catholicism could recommend itself to the higher and more intellectual classes of society; but the question remained, how were the lower classes to be reached? The Methodists supplied hearty and cheerful services; whilst coldness and formality, even after the revival of Catholicism, still continued to characterise the Church's services. In fact the object of the Tractarians was to revive and disseminate primitive *doctrine*, but they did not direct their attention to that which was necessary to, and a consequence of, their teaching, viz., *Ritual*.

There can be no doubt that the Rubrics sanction, nay, that they even authorise, an ornate Ritual. The Prayers are to be *said* or *sung*, that is to say, monotoned or intoned, the former being in the natural tone of voice: it is nowhere prescribed that they are to be *read*. The Litany is to be *sung* or *said*. Canticles, Anthems, and Psalms imply the accompaniment of music. The Liturgy, in which the Rubrics clearly designate the Sacrificial office of the Priest, is capable of a high and splendid ritual, with a choral service. Vestments, Incense, the two Lights; are either enjoined by the Rubrics, or are allowable, because nowhere forbidden, by Catholic usage; these and such like adjuncts are of the highest importance, especially in evangelising the middle and lower classes, not so much in themselves from an æsthetic point of view, but as bringing into relief, more clearly and more forcibly than any other mode of teaching, the doctrines which they symbolise, and of which they are the outward and visible signs.

> "Signius irritant animos demissa per aurem
> Quam quæ sunt oculis subjecta fidelibus."

We need not stop to inquire into the undoubted ecclesiastical legality of such accessories; the law of custom, which means, being interpreted, the law of idleness and neglect,

although it may throw its ægis over those who claim its protection, cannot render unlawful that which has the sanction of primitive usage; for rites and ceremonies can only be decreed, and therefore only abrogated, by the Church. The decision of Dr. Lushington on this point is clear: "By the law of England no statute passeth into desuetude. It is true that a statute may become obsolete in one sense, that is, not enforced. It is true that no call can be made on the Judges of the land to enforce it; that by common consent a statute may lie dormant; but if once a Court is called upon to carry it into execution, it must do so."

It is true, the use of a grand and ornate Ritual had long been dormant in the Church; that for more than two hundred years it had not been practised; but it was nowhere forbidden. An attempt had been made during that period to set forth religion, and to perform the services, with a meagre Ritual, and often with no Ritual at all; and it had failed. The congregations of the Church had fallen away from it.

An alarming state of things, notwithstanding the revival of Catholicism, was apparent; the Church was still reaping the mischievous results of former neglect. What was to be done? The Dissenters made religion as attractive as possible to the masses, and had succeeded where

the Church had failed. It was with a view to making the services more in harmony with the teaching and spirit of the Prayer Book, to rendering her services more attractive, especially to the poorer and labouring classes, that Ritualism, the necessary and natural exponent of Catholicism, revived. It was no innovation, but the bringing into life and prominence rites and ceremonies, which, however long disused, were primitive, and sanctioned by the past use of the Anglican, and the present use of the Greek and Latin Churches; which also were directly authorized or implied in the Rubrics and services of the Church before and since the Reformation; which had never been abrogated by any law of the Church; but were simply in abeyance.

The wisdom of the revival was decided by the results. Numbers of Dissenters and of people who never attended any Church at all were brought into the Church; Communicants immensely increased, so that the frequency of Celebrations was multiplied; the Holy Eucharist instead of weekly, was celebrated daily; the daily services were largely attended; men of business were enabled to attend the short services and the early Communions; Guilds and Sisterhoods were formed; ladies were found willing to devote their time, and strength, even life itself, to the service of the Church, in

attending the sick and dying. The Church's system (of which no one conversant with the Prayer Book can be ignorant) in Confession and Absolution, the Bread which had been so cruelly taken out of the children's mouths, was again restored, to the comfort of many a penitent—these and many others were the immediate results of Ritualism, and the more distant results of Catholicism, of which Ritualism was the handmaid; and now conversions to Rome from Ritualism are scarcely ever heard of; while many of those have returned, who through persecution, or faint-heartedness, or ignorance of her system, had left the Church of their Baptism.

We can form some estimate of the advance which Ritualism has made from the words of a pervert to Rome about twenty years ago; he says: "I believe in the whole of London there is to be found but one small chapel in which Communion is administered every day; and I happen to know that some difficulty has been found in obtaining constantly a sufficient number, that is three persons, without which no Celebration can take place according to the rites of the Establishment."

The political newspapers of the day decry the movement, whilst they have over and over again confessed that the learning and zeal of the Church are on the side of the Ritualists,

and that they have great influence with the lower classes. Of course any religious movement, except of the extreme Broad Church type, expects and would prefer to have the *Times* against it; the *Times* in favour of the Church would indeed be a dangerous novelty. It is somewhat curious to conjecture by what mental process the Press can arrive at their conclusions.

> "Whatever is good should be practised."
> "Ritualism is good."
> ∴ "Ritualism should *not* be practised."

It is of course possible to deny the major premiss; but allowing that, the above syllogism does not belie the staple argument which the Press uses against the Ritualists.

On the whole, it is the Liberal Press which have treated the Ritualistic movement with the greatest fairness. About a year ago, if we remember correctly (for we write from memory), the correspondent of the *Daily Telegraph* gave a very fair and candid account of a visit he paid, for the sake of gaining information, to a Ritualist Church in London. It was an early Celebration, on a bitterly cold day in the middle of winter. He was struck with the number of Communicants. He expected to find some such Ritual as would accompany a High Celebration; something of a highly sensational character, with grand music; something comfort-

ing and consoling as a counterpoise to the outer inclemency of the weather. He found nothing of the sort. No creature comfort in the shape of a warm church; nothing sensational, nothing outwardly attractive; nothing that could leave a doubt in his mind as to the one object that had brought its worshippers to the church on that inclement morning. And be it remembered this is no over-drawn or unusual picture, but the daily life of many so-called Ritualists.

The revival of Ritualism dates from 1859, when the S. George's-in-the-East Riots were organised in a West-end drawing-room, in dealing with which Justice's justice in England gained for itself such an unenviable notoriety. This persecution gave to Ritualism the needed impetus. In 1866, the question of vestments, Altar-lights, Elevation after Consecration, the censing persons and things, the use of wafer-bread, and other matters were brought, but without any result, before the Lower House of Convocation. In 1867 a Bill was brought into the House of Lords by Lord Shaftesbury, with a view of confining the vestments to the surplice and hood; in favour of this Bill a petition was signed by 600 persons; whereas another petition against it, signed by 40,000 *Communicants*, was presented by Lord Redesdale. This Bill was withdrawn on the promise

of the late Lord Derby to appoint a Royal Commission. The Commission sat nineteen times, but effected nothing; they indeed invented that wonderful specimen of humanity, the "aggrieved parishioner;" and they made some remarks as to what it was expedient to do; but as they recommended no way of doing it, matters were left much as they were before the appointment of the Commission. Since then, the "aggrieved parishioner" has appeared upon the scene once or twice; lately he has disappeared;—the Bennett judgment has given the death blow to the hopes of Protestants; Ritualism is spreading on all sides; and now the vestments are worn in some thirty churches in London, and there is scarcely a town where, at least in one church, the highest Ritual is not carried out.

The triumph of Ritualism is the triumph of moral over physical force. If the Bishops had wanted to put it down, they should have left it alone; when once it was dragged before the Privy Council, its victory was certain. That the Bishops did not understand the character of the movement, and could not see the gigantic form of Rationalism looming in the distance, nor that Catholicism required all its combined forces for the coming struggle, is somewhat strange.

But when we consider the state of religion

during the first half of this century, even since the revival in 1833, and the change which Ritualism produced, it is not at all surprising, that it should at its commencement have excited alarm, and encountered hostility. For in Ritualism there was something so novel: something so opposed to the prevailing Conservatism of English churchmanship; at variance too with the fondly cherished, but mistaken ideas of the Reformation; that no one could help wondering when he heard or saw doctrines and practices and vestments, which he had been taught to regard as superstitious and to associate with Rome.

It is true, Ritualism is only a later and natural development of those doctrines which Tractarianism had brought back into life; but between the two there was a marked difference; for the latter was quiet and unobtrusive, being concerned mostly with such matters as the Apostolical Succession, Baptismal Regeneration, or the Real Presence; which were subjects about which people at that time knew but little, and troubled themselves still less.

And, again, it was hoped by people, who were but unskilled interpreters of the times, that Tractarianism was moribund, if not altogether extinct. But its revival in a more obnoxious form, in its visible development;—the various-coloured stoles; the gorgeous chan-

cel; the re-Table with the Cross and Candles upon it; and above all the incense and vestments; all these were things which each one could see for himself, and which all at first, with scarcely an exception, viewed with dislike, and which it was generally agreed must be put down, if not by ecclesiastical law, at any rate by Parliament.

So that no one can be surprised that a revival, or as it was regarded, an innovation, so alien to Protestant feelings and habits, so opposed to the luxurious spirit of the day, should have been attacked with fierce and undisguised, and sometimes lawless, hostility. This was but the storm which was to clear the atmosphere. What is far more surprising is that Ritualism should in so short a time have overcome this hostility; that now, so far from encountering more than its due share of opposition, it has taken so strong a hold on the wills, yes and on the affections too of the people, that not only would it be impossible for the fleshy arm of the law to put it down; but, to say the least, it holds its own against any other section of the English Church.

For Ritualism is a "reasonable service." It is the duty of the Church, in her missionary capacity, to go into the lanes and streets of our cities, and to force men, by all legitimate means, to come in and claim their place in the

Church's privileges. Can any one deny that the hearts of a mixed congregation are often reached through the eye, as well as the ear? or that the uneducated are attracted by the outward grandeur of religion? And are not the whole of the Church's services based upon Ritual? The cruciform churches; the different parts into which the church is divided, the nave for its ordinary services, the chancel for the Sacrifice of the Altar, the Font for baptism, the use of the Cross; standing, kneeling, sitting; are not all these points of Ritual? But they are all enjoined; and yet no one would contend that it was impossible to conduct the services without them.

And then, again, are not the Sacraments partly and essentially Ritualistic? Is there not an outward sign, as well as an inward grace? No one maintains that the Water in Baptism, or the Bread and Wine in the Holy Eucharist are the whole Sacrament; but every one knows they are symbolic, and therefore Ritualistic. And here lies the whole value of Ritual; it is valuable just so far as it represents and sets forth inward truths by outward signs; only so far as it is symbolic. Take away the symbolism of the two Lights upon the altar, or the incense, or the vestments, or the elevation in the Holy Eucharist; and these matters return to their intrinsic value.

If Ritualism had been a new-fangled invention of these latter days, if it had only been an exhibition of æsthetic grandeur, instead of the exponent of Catholic doctrine, it could never have weathered the almost unanimous hostility it at first encountered, nor have commended itself in so short a time to the reason and the affection of the English nation.

For there was one accusation brought against it, of which English people are particularly sensitive, viz., that it makes perverts to Rome. Let us appeal to facts. The Evangelical revival at the end of the last and the beginning of the present century drove men by thousands into Dissent; and now Ritualism is bringing back, and that almost daily and in increasing numbers, the families of those very people, whom Protestantism had so long alienated from the Church. That some good and learned men have left the ranks of Catholicism and joined Rome, men whose loss the Church feels, cannot be denied. But it must be remarked, in the first place, that these secessions for the most part took place under the earlier manifestation of the Catholic movement. In the second place, it may with truth be said of a great number of these perverts that they left us either through ignorance or persecution; either because they were driven from us through the false accusation that they were Romanists in

disguise; or they left us because they saw no alternative between Protestantism and Rome; whilst of most of them it would not be untrue to say, that if they were amongst us now, and professed the same doctrines which they held at their secession, they would scarcely receive the appellation of High Churchmen.

But at the present day, whilst many perverts return to us, perversion from the ranks of the Ritualists to Rome is almost unknown. Why should people leave one branch of the Catholic Church to join another, which to say the least, is in England schismatical? England has laid claim to Catholicism as her birthright, which she has never sold; she asserts and gives undoubted truth that she has never rejected the Primitive Faith; that she holds and teaches the same *truths* as Rome, whilst she abjures Rome's *errors*.

Like every other Christian movement, Ritualism has encountered, and overcome persecution. The violence of mob law, and principalities and powers, and the Privy Council have done their worst, and have only strengthened it. To think that persecution is ended, and that it has no enemies to contend with, would be foolish. In this respect England is not more civilised than it was at the Reformation. The law renders the fires of Smithfield impossible; but as long as Lynch law prevails,

and is upheld in the so-called Courts of Justice; when men, who never go to Church except for the purpose of reviling and interrupting the service, can act with impunity; when there is a serious doubt whether midnight services can be continued in the Metropolis without fear of insult and danger to those who attend them; we can scarcely say that England is more enlightened in the latter end of the nineteenth than it was in the sixteenth century. Whilst a body of men can be found so wicked as to subscribe £60,000 to be spent in persecution, at a time when so much poverty and misery exist to claim their charity and stem their hatred, it is idle to think that persecution is ended. But amongst the more rational opponents of Ritualism, some are less narrow-minded than they were formerly. Some have seen and confess the good work that it is doing, and would be unwilling to drive out of the Church some of her most pious, most zealous, and most learned members; whilst others, who are opposed to every form of religion but their own, or to all religion altogether, know full well that the expulsion of the Ritualists from the Church could not be effected without certain danger to that which, on political grounds, they consider of paramount importance; viz., the Establishment.

S. Chrysostom says that "people indifferent

about religion give no trouble." Ritualists are not indifferent about religion, and therefore do give trouble. But if a false alarm arises, it is the fault of those who cause it. England is essentially a land of panics; now it is a panic in the money market; now about the navy; now about the army: can we be surprised that there is occasionally a panic about the Church?

The imaginary enemy in the last case is Rome. It is somewhat strange that the real and increasing danger of Infidelity causes no alarm. It is true, of late years Rome has gained ground in England; but that is only the reaction from Protestantism. The Church of England, until the revival of Catholicism, boasted that it was Protestant, and refused to be called Catholic. Rome saw the opening made for her and seized the opportunity. The teaching of Catholicism first, and afterwards Ritualism, have established beyond doubt the purity of the Anglican Church against the corruption of Rome. What more powerful engine than that which Ritualism opposes to Rome? The former appeals to the early Fathers, to the first two General Councils, to its own primitive Liturgy, to its formularies and prayers. Rome claims to be Catholic too, and to enjoy a supremacy over all the churches of Christendom; and to what does she appeal?—To

the Vatican Council of 1870, which has about as much authority amongst the other Churches of Christendom, as the Council, falsely called general, which sanctioned Arianism.

Chapter V.

RATIONALISM.

THERE are no doubt many modifications of Rationalism—as for instance, the character which it assumes in England is in many respects different from that which it assumes in France and Germany; but there is always one distinctive mark of its character under all shades and differences, viz., that it would entirely eliminate everything supernatural from religion. In England at the present day it is greatly influenced by the growth of science, and the popular theories of the times, and accordingly it assumes the garb of a spurious liberality in harmony with the political tendencies of the day; it teaches that it does not signify what a man believes, as long as he acts up to his knowledge; and that if the Bible fails to commend itself to the human intellect, the deductions of the latter must be received as true and the teaching of the Bible rejected as false. It inculcates the Christian virtues, and aims at an ideal Christianity, when brotherly love shall reign and wars cease; but

this ideal Christianity would eject all dogmatic Theology, the Creeds, and even the Bible itself, except so far as it harmonises with its own views, or can be proved to be consonant with human reasoning, and what is called common sense.

Even those who most admire the Reformation will scarcely deny that the good which it effected was accompanied by much evil also; one such evil was the rise of private judgment against ecclesiastical authority, and the introduction, as its consequence, of Infidelity into Europe. For, previous to the Reformation, the prevalence of Infidelity to any extent within the Church would have been impossible, at a time when the authority of the Church was held paramount in controversies of Faith. To the Church all questions, both of discipline and government, as well as of the interpretation of doctrine, were submitted for decision. But at the Reformation, not indeed as its immediate but its ulterior result, a different order of things ensued. In England no doubt the object of the first Reformers was to introduce a system which, whilst it was no less dogmatic than that which had previously existed, should bear the impress of the primitive rather than the mediæval Church. So far the Reformation would have been an unmitigated good; its results were unfortunately different. For whatever blame

we may attach to mediæval Rome, no one will deny that she had preserved the authority and discipline of the Church. But this was now to be changed: independence of all authority was to be the watchward of the day. Before long the teaching and authority of the Church was openly assailed, and a controversy arose which convulsed all Europe. The seed of Rationalism was sown; the struggle between Reason and Revelation had begun. The author, although his name does not attach itself to a sect till some time afterwards, was Socinus. But the full danger did not manifest itself all at once. At first, as is often the case, there was a compromise; men thought, as philosophers, they could appeal to reason; whilst, as Catholics, they could hold to the authority of the Church. But by degrees, the authority of Reason over Revelation was asserted and maintained with unflagging and increasing zeal; and strange as it might appear, were it not evident that Rationalism is the logical deduction from Protestantism, the name of Zuingle, the author as he may be considered of Protestantism, is associated with that of Socinus, as the forerunner of the Rationalistic doctrines which prevailed at the end of the seventeenth and thoughout the eighteenth century.

But what concern us mostly is the history of Rationalism in England. Its introduction into

this country may partly be attributed to the anarchy produced by the Commonwealth; although partly no doubt it was a re-action from the dread of Romanism which the reign of James II. had infused into the minds of the people. It is perhaps owing to this hatred of Rome, that the hatred also, not only of the Romish Priesthood, but of the Hierarchy in general, and the dread of an imaginary Priestcraft arose, which so characterised and materially influenced the Infidelity of the eighteenth century. From the Priesthood this dislike extended to the Church, and the first attacks of Rationalism were directed against the supernatural mysteries of religion, against all dogma, the Sacraments, and all doctrines which necessitated the existence of a Priesthood. Even Locke (the author, it may be feared, although the unintentional author, of a great amount of the subsequent error that prevailed) unwilling as he would have been to countenance the coarse and slanderous imputations against the clergy, taught that the New Testament Epistles, when they contain any mystery or any doctrine not plain to the understanding, need not be accepted, and that a belief in the Messiah was the only necessary article of Faith contained in the Bible.

When Rationalism had once gained a footing in this country, there were not wanting extraneous causes to keep it alive: one of which no

doubt was the provalent immorality during the reign of Charles II., and the vicious example set by the King and the licentious Court. For a time indeed it was kept under by the influence of the Caroline Bishops. But with the accession of the house of Brunswick it broke out again and assumed greater proportions. And we need not look far for the reasons of this new outbreak. The luxurious lives and the evil examples set by the Bishops of that time, an example which the two lower orders of the clergy only too willingly followed; the lack of education and the decrease of learning; the want of church accommodation, and the general low state of public morality; these, whilst they led to Methodism and Dissent on the one hand, led to indifference and Infidelity on the other. Whether in the first instance Rationalism was indigenous or not, may be doubted; but at any rate at a later date it was fostered by the prevalent Infidelity of Germany, and by the rise of the Theophilanthropists and the Revolution in France; and from that time to this it has existed, sometimes with milder and sometimes with graver symptoms; whilst fuel has been added to it, amongst the lower classes, by the pernicious writings of a cheap literature; and amongst the higher and more educated classes by the spread of scientific at the expense of theological literature, and in no small degree by the writ-

ings of England's great historian, the popular, but no less vicious Gibbon. Rationalism in the eighteenth century was an almost necessary consequence of the spiritual lethargy and indifference which prevailed. The sermons of the time appealed mostly if not solely to the intellect; inculcated a system of moral philosophy; everything like patristic theology or an appeal to primitive authority was carefully avoided. Their subject was not practice, but theory; and great care was taken to prove that religion was agreeable to common sense and human reason, and that Christianity was in consonance with the benefit of society.

In the middle of the nineteenth century a new School of thought has sprung up in England, within the Church, which is commonly known as the Broad, but which might more appropriately be designated the Rationalistic School. This school is said to derive its origin from Dr. Arnold, who taught that the perfection of Christian doctrine consists in clearly understanding that Christ's death has rendered all Priesthoods, Sacrifices, and Ceremonies, for the time to come unimportant.

The kind of religion which this Rationalistic School aim at establishing, and on which they calculate as certain is no great length of time to be the future religion of England, we may conjecture from a recent article which appeared

in one of their Reviews: "The Church of the future will not be a body such as those labouring for it are aiming at; it must be a very different thing, with a basis purely ethical, divested of dogmatic proportions, the notions of Apostolic succession, of Episcopal Ordination unbroken; in short of the Ceremonies and Rites which encumber or crush true life." This same Review says again: "Outward axioms are worth little, especially when they are brought about by the retention of the three most ancient Creeds, by the incorporation of Orthodox doctrines, and by minor compromises."

The Duke of Somerset, who would probably pride himself on being, if anything, a staunch Protestant, in a recent work entitled "Christian Theology and Modern Scepticism," deduces from the right of private judgment (the birthright of Protestants) the privilege "sentire quæ velis et quæ sentias dicere;" and he alleges, as his excuse, that inquiry cannot well make matters worse than they are. Probably, it cannot.

Rationalism in England generally admits the historical narrative; and it sometimes agrees that the Bible account of creation is not inconsistent with the later discoveries of Geology. In this respect it does not go the full length with the German theologians, or the teaching of Strauss. This latter denies the creation of

the world, and accepts as his dogma the *natura naturans* and the *natura naturata* of Spinoza. He ignores the historical truth of the Bible. Even Renan is too orthodox for him; whilst he ridicules Ebrard for believing in the narrative of the Evangelists.

On the contrary, in England, Rationalism (for the most part) theoretically believes in God; believes in Him, that is, as the Creator of the world; believes in the Bible as historically true, though not inspired, and subject to the same errors which may be found in any other book. But beyond this, everything is subjected to the test of reason; Christ's miracles, and everything in His life on earth, outside the ordinary course of human events, are accepted or rejected on mere natural principles, no number of eye-witnesses being sufficient to outweigh the testimony of the known laws of Nature. The motto of the Rationalists is "de non apparentibus et de non existentibus eadem est ratio;" some few of the less advanced hold that anything supernatural is *incredible;* but the vast majority maintain that whatever in the Bible does not conform with what they see and believe to be the ordinary laws of the universe, could not have happened in the way in which it is related, or is *impossible*, and therefore must be rejected.

Rationalism is at any rate outspoken enough:

in dealing with it, whether in England or elsewhere, we have to say the least are open and intelligible opponent; it has a platform, and it has the honesty to confess it; viz., that "the Bible is to be interpreted as any other book." Rationalists look for an intellectual certainty in religion, such as a problem in Euclid would afford. They would eliminate all revealed and dogmatic truth unless it comes up to their standard, and squares in with their preconceived ideas: that the Saviour worked miracles they reject as contrary to reason; they would hold Him as a mere historic Personage; as an ideal man, the most perfect that ever lived, and therefore a pattern and an example; but not as the Son of God, or as having any existence previous to that which he derived in the Manger of Bethlehem.

The unreasonableness of such a view of the Saviour's character does not appear to present itself to Rationalists. He expressly states Himself that He worked miracles; over and over again He professes Himself to be the Son of God. It is evident therefore that He either was the Son of God and did work miracles, or He was an impostor; and, if an impostor, how could He be an example or a pattern according to which we should fashion our lives?

The system advocated by Rationalists as agreeable to reason, is in many respects the

most unreasonable which the human intellect could have devised. To look for mathematical proof in religion or the actual evidence of the senses is, from the very nature of the case, to look for an impossibility; the Existence and Nature of God are not capable of such a scientific or sensible demonstration, for the reason that God is Infinite and Invisible. God has revealed to man, just as much, and no more, of His nature as it is practically necessary for man to know. To demand abstract certainty is to demand, more than we require in the most important matters of every-day life; why should we not be satisfied in religion if the aggregate evidence of probabilities, even without the authority of the Bible, renders such great doctrines as the Incarnation and the Atonement—doctrines which, though certainly not contrary to, are above, our Finite understanding—a matter of moral certainty?

That Rationalism is opposed to right reason; that the very tests which it applies to religion are unreasonable, is evident; the question arises. Is Revelation opposed to Reason? or, is the Bible opposed to the discoveries of modern science? In answering this, we must remember what the Bible is. It is an appeal from God to man's faith, and not his reason. If we turn to the Book of Genesis, we do not find that it attempts to *prove* the existence of God, but it points to the

works of creation as a sufficient evidence of His Existence. From what we know in nature, as well as from experience, the non-existence of God involves many more difficulties than His existence. Similarly, the deeper we search into science, the clearer becomes the knowledge of the Creator; the greater the certainty that there must be one Great First Cause who brought the world into being: "The heavens declare the glory of God, and the firmament showeth His handy work."

Rationalists reject miracles. Can there be any stronger evidence in favour of miracles than that which is derived from science? For what are the successive stages of creation through which the world has passed, but so many miracles? Geology has established beyond a doubt, from obsolete remains embedded in the strata of the earth, that there must have been successive creations, at long intervals, before the creation of man; that these creations must have been overwhelmed and carried away by some violent motion of the earth, to make room for new ones; and that the earth's temperature has so changed from time to time, that the animal creation of one period could not have existed under the altered temperature of another. And long after these creations came man.

How, then, can the creations of such various

species—at long intervals, and with such different physical and moral qualities—be accounted for, except on the ground of Divine supervision, and the mediation and direct intervention of God? The faculty of reason and the discoveries of science afford the strongest evidence in favour of miracles; and if God worked miracles in the earliest stages of the world's existence, what reason is there for doubting that He worked them afterwards under the old as well as the Gospel Dispensation? or that He worked them in the most important part of the world's history, the Redemption of Man and the establishment of Christianity?

But the reason that Rationalists give for rejecting miracles, viz., because they are a violation of the laws of Nature, is somewhat strange. Increasing knowledge and the discovery of new sciences have given to man a knowledge and a power over matter, which he did not possess formerly: and what is now regarded as the ordinary result of science, would to persons living a thousand years ago have been a miracle. Are we to suppose that the Divine Intelligence is only on a level with the human? that man's knowledge is always to be progressing, whilst God's is standing still? or that His power over matter can only be commensurate with that of man? or can only be exercised in proportion to the discoveries of human science? Rationalists

appeal to reason as the test of miracles; can they say that their knowledge of natural laws is complete, or that what would be accounted as miracles now, may not, in a more advanced state of physical science, be found to be no violation of natural laws, and therefore, according to their own definitions of the word, no miracles at all?

But now let us inquire what modern thinkers of at least equal ability with English Rationalists of the present day say on the subject. Paley says: "Once believe there is a God, and miracles are not incredible." And Lord Bacon: "Sound theology is grounded upon the work and oracles of God, and not upon the light of nature; and the doctrine of religion, as well moral as mystical, is not to be attained but by inspiration and revelation of God." And Bishop Butler: "One cannot read a passage relating to the great mystery of godliness, but which immediately runs up into something which shows us our ignorance." And Bishop Butler recommends an excellent way of reconciling apparent contradictions: "If in Revelation there be found any passages, the *seeming* meaning of which is contrary to natural religion, we may certainly conclude such seeming meaning not to be the right one."

It is evident that Rationalism in its mode

of dealing with Revelation, is not the use, but the abuse, of intellect. It is the employment of reason in divine matters in a manner for which reason was not given; it is setting up what is finite against the infinite. The very rudiments of the Bible are such as men without the Bible could never grasp, and of which the greatest philosophers of old were ignorant. Without the Bible no exercise of the reason, no power of the intellect, no logical deductions, could prove the existence of heaven or hell; or the redemption of the world; could account for the inequalities of rank, riches, and intellect; or for the existence of sin; or understand that sin is sin, not only because it is injurious to man, but because it is an offence against God. Reason, no doubt, might do something; because it sees that sin brings its recompense in this life, it might arrive at the probability of a future state of reward or punishment; but that the body as well as the soul is immortal would baffle the intellect of the wisest men now, as it did the philosophers of antiquity.

And if absolute certainty be the thing required, and the means of obtaining it depend upon man's reason, is it not evident that one man will arrive at one conclusion, and another at another? that "quot hominum tot sententiæ?" Their conclusions would often be diametrically opposed; one man's reason leading him

to adopt Romanism, another's Socinianism, another's perhaps Mormonism; can all these conclusions be the truth? or does it not signify which of them he believes?

And further does not this view of Rationalism establish a different religion for rich and poor, for educated and uneducated? If the wise of this world are to be saved by their wisdom, and the things of God are intellectually discerned, what becomes, in that case, of the unlearned and poor? of more than half of the inhabited globe, who have neither the opportunity, nor the ability for abstruse theological speculation?

But this school ignores intellectual fallibility; denies mysteries; refuses everything which each man's reason cannot comprehend; miracles, prophecies, Types, Creeds, Ritual, the doctrines of the Trinity and the Sacraments; revealed and dogmatic teaching alike.

The worst and most dangerous feature in Rationalism remains to be revealed. Not only is Rationalism ripe amongst the laity; but some Priests of the Church also, not satisfied with the introduction of metaphysical speculation, have of late years combined the Neology of Germany with the Sacraments and Ordinances of the Church; and hold that their tenets, so far from excluding them from their office is consistent with the Bible, properly interpreted, and

the Church's teaching. Clergymen, nay even a Bishop, in the present day are to be found who teach that the Bible is not given by Inspiration of God; that it contains erroneous statements; nay, one clergyman taught with impunity that "a dark crust of human error and passion overlies many parts of the Bible." Not long ago a clergyman resigned his preferment, and he imagined his orders too, because he could not conscientiously repeat "God spake these words" at the commencement of the Commandments. His reason was sufficiently intelligible; he did not believe God *did* speak those words. But his conduct was blamed by his Broad-Church brethren, who thought such scrupulousness an undesirable precedent.

It must be clear to all that a very different spirit is abroad than that which prevailed in the earlier ages of the Church's history. Then it was profane to doubt; now it is a sign of weakness to believe without doubting. This is pre-eminently a secular age, and everything must be judged by a Rationalistic standard. The tendency of free thought, and the repugnance to dogmatic teaching which prevails, would once have been regarded as a subversion of Christianity altogether. It is foolish to shut our eyes to the danger that hangs over us. Fathers, now-a-days, hold religious opinions which they would shudder to communicate to

their children, and which they keep pent up in their breasts for fear of unsettling the faith of their wives. They may hold, for perhaps they have forced themselves into the belief, that there are no such places as heaven and hell; but what a danger hangs over society, when the head of a family holds views with regard to the most fundamental points of religion which he dare not communicate even to those who are flesh of his flesh and bone of his bone!

Chapter VI.

NONCONFORMITY.

PREVIOUS to the Reformation Dissent from the doctrines and discipline of the Church was a thing almost unknown; if for no other reason, yet because the severity of the laws rendered its existence, or perhaps its profession, impossible. But soon after the Reformation, at a time when learning and a desire to search the Scriptures for themselves was taking an increasing hold on men's minds, questions arose as to the interpretation of the word "Church;" whether it was intended there should be one universal Church under an earthly Head, or whether the word was coextensive with that of "congregation." Those who held the latter meaning, separated from the Church, and assumed the name of Independents or Congregationalists.

But the great pioneers of modern Dissent were the Puritans; a sect *within* the Church; who, although advocating Presbyterianism, claimed the right to remain members of the

National Church, from which they did not openly secede till 1662.

What then was this Nonconforming Churchmanship called Puritanism; and when and how did it arise?

During the reign of Mary many Englishman, clergy and laity, had left England and sought refuge in Germany and Switzerland. At her death, and on the accession of Elizabeth to the throne, hoping for times more favourable to their own religious views, they returned to England. But they brought with them the Calvinistic spirit which the Continental Reformers had infused into the religion of those countries. The English Reformation had been conducted on exactly the opposite principle to that on the continent. It retained many doctrines and many ceremonies which the foreign Reformers had repudiated. Amongst these may be enumerated the retention of the Episcopacy, Confirmation, Confession, and Absolution, a prescribed form of Prayer derived from the ancient Breviaries, Vestments, and amongst them the surplice, and the observance of Saints' Days—all these found small favour with them, and little accorded with their notions of pure religion. This party assumed to themselves the name of Puritans. But we must draw a distinction between the two periods in their history; the first prior to 1662 when they

remained as members of the Church, up to which time, from the form of government which they advocated, they may be termed Presbyterians; the second, after 1662, when they left the Church and became Dissenters.

At the former of these two periods, the idea of leaving the Church does not appear to have occurred to them. They held that the Reformation had not sufficiently reformed the Church; and their object was to bring about a further Reformation after the model of Geneva; to abolish Episcopacy, and set up a Presbyterian Establishment with the Genevan Service Book in lieu of that of Edward VI. They were supported in their views by such men as Jewel, Cooper, and Whitgift. But the result of their fatal conflict with the Church was not the accomplishment of their object by the Establishment of Presbyterianism but the formation of a number of sects, and their ultimate banishment from the Church.

A long period of disorder and confusion followed. As by degrees the spirit of Puritanism leavened the country, all outward decency in religion disappeared. In Church every one did what was right in his own eyes. The Priest wore either Vestment or his ordinary coat, as best suited his fancy; the Altars were brought out of the Chancels and placed lengthways in the Nave; the Dean of Christ Church

refused even to wear the square cap at public meetings; and profanities were committed too blasphemous to mention.

The Queen's feelings naturally led her to the Catholic views of the Reformation; and in her own Chapel she still maintained the Crucifix and the lighted candles. She determined to remove the scandals which Puritanism had introduced into the Church; scandals which were in no small degree owing to the carelessness of Archbishop Parker and the Bishops; she therefore gave instructions to the former to draw up an order to enforce uniformity in Vestments, as well as in other rites and ceremonies. The Puritans had set themselves to an open defiance of the law and of the civil magistrates. But now unfortunately a system of persecution was inaugurated. Laws were passed against them. A fine of £20 was imposed for continued absence from Church. Publishing libels against the Church or Queen was punished with death. But this only increased the hatred and hostility of the Puritans, who now looked forward to the death of the Queen, and the time when the throne would be occupied by a Presbyterian King.

But all their hopes was destined to disappointment. James was a man of too deep learning and penetration not to see through the errors of Puritanism, and not to understand that re-

bellion in religion is the sure parent of rebellion in the State. At the same time he allowed a Conference to be held at Hampton Court, for the purpose of settling the disputes between the Presbyterians and the Church. The Puritans were allowed to state their objections; but the Conference was unfavourable to them. The King expressed his determination to uphold "one doctrine and one discipline, one religion in substance and ceremony; and if the Puritans would not conform, he would either make them or 'harrie them out of the land.'"

The Hampton Court Conference was held in 1603. By the middle of the century a different state of things presented itself. The incompetence of Abbot led to a great increase in the number and influence of the Puritans, who now gained possession of many of the Churches; and Laud paid the penalty of Abbot's mischievous policy. Notwithstanding all Laud's efforts, the Puritans triumphed; a Presbyterian Parliament ruled the country; a Presbyterian Church was established; and the King was a prisoner in the hands of the Puritans.

During the Presbyterian ascendancy, more than seven thousand clergy were obliged to resign their benefices; some sought for safety in flight, but many were imprisoned. The vacancies were filled up by Presbyterian nominees,

two or three being held by one person, notwithstanding the objection Puritans had before professed against pluralities: Collins says that more were turned out of their livings by the Puritans than by the Papists under Queen Mary.

To the present day our churches bear witness to Puritan bigotry, in the mutilation of painted windows, of brasses, of tombs, and churches. Valuable works of art, pictures and sculptures, and all representations of the Blessed Virgin and the Saints, were ruthlessly destroyed. Games and amusements were forbidden; the gloominess of the Jewish Sabbath was substituted for the joyfulness of the Christian's Sunday; Christmas, the most joyful day in all the year, was made a fast; and none, except those who have about them the outward signs of Puritanical saintliness, were admitted members of the Barebones Parliament.

On the accession of Charles II. a new Parliament was called, and an Act of Uniformity was passed. By this Act all were excluded from the Priesthood who had not received Episcopal Ordination: whilst subscription to the Book of Common Prayer was enforced. Of the seven thousand Presbyterians who had gained possession of the livings of the Episcopal Church, five thousand preferred to comply rather than be ejected from what they had

so unlawfully acquired; whilst only two thousand, or, according to another authority, twelve hundred, were found to resign their livings to those whom they had so unjustly deprived of their rights.

Up to this time, therefore, the Puritans had continued in the membership of the Church; but from 1662 they became merged in the various sects of schismatical Nonconformists. Severe laws were passed against them; and the Parliament enforced systematically the principle of universal conformity to the doctrines and discipline of the Established Church.

But on the accession of William and Mary the laws against Nonconformity were relaxed; and in 1688 Nonconformity, except that of Romanists and Unitarians (the latter of whom were not included until 1813) was for the first time legalised by the Toleration Act; an oath of allegiance and partial subscription of the Articles being required. At the same time it was proposed to comprehend Presbyterians and Independents in the Established Church; an innovation to which neither of these sects was averse, and which was only averted by the strong opposition of the Lower House of Convocation.

Nonconformity seems to have attained the highest point of power which it ever reached shortly after the Revolution. But it does not

appear to have fared so well in prosperity as in adversity; and now it seemed on the point of dying out altogether.

But in the middle of the eighteenth century it received help from a quarter from which it could least have expected it; and from that time it has put forth renewed strength. The rise of Methodism, partly through the opposition made to it by the Church; and partly from accidental causes which Methodists little foresaw, and which the most thoughtful of them at the present day must lament, marked the era of the new birth of Dissent. The Wesleyans of that day, so far from meaning to be Dissenters, were to the Church what the Ritualists are in the present day. Wesley ought to have been made a bishop: if he had been, who can tell, who can even imagine, how different now would have been the position not only of the Anglican Church, but of Christendom at large? How can the Wesleyans reconcile separation from the Church with the reverence which they profess to feel for their great founder? It was his expressed decree that none who regarded his memory should separate from the Church. He showed them an example both in his life and death; "I live and die" he said, "a member of the Church of England." It was his intention that the movement which he com-

menced should be a revival of that Church; his followers have carried out his often repeated wishes in such a manner that Wesleyism in the present day, so far from assisting in the revival of that Church, has been, not only the revival, but the mainstay, of her enemies.

But Dissenters, as a rule, do not profess hostility to the doctrines of the Church. In fact people in remote rural districts, if you talk to them about the Church and Dissent, often tell that "it is all one;" and of those who constantly, perhaps habitually, frequent the chapel, many profess a partiality for the church. What then can be the reason for the great prevalence of Dissent in the present day, numbering, as all the combined sects do, nearly a third of the entire population?

Now it must be confessed with shame that the prevalence of Dissent in the present day is in great measure to be attributed to the supineness and lethargy of the Church in times past, from which she has only of late years begun to awake. A short study of statistics is necessary to enable us to see how immense, and how unequally distributed, was the increase of population, compared with the almost stagnant state of the Church, during the last century and the first quarter of this.

If Nonconformity has in some shape or other

existed since the Reformation, for a long time it was kept in abeyance, and only of late years has it assumed such large proportions. Thus at the beginning of the seventeenth century, the number of Communicants was 2,050,000; whilst the total number of Dissenters was only 8465. But the spread of commerce and the increase of the manufacturing industry of the country, produced a state of things altogether unprecedented in the history either of this or any other country, with which all the efforts of the Church, even if they had been properly and strenuously directed, could not have kept pace. Whilst barren moors were swelling into villages, villages into towns, and towns into cities, and the rural population were crowding from the villages into the cities, no adequate accommodation could be supplied to meet an emergency so unexpected and so novel.

At the beginning of the eighteenth century, the population of England was about five and a half millions; in 1851 it had increased to more than eighteen millions. At the former period the two largest towns in England next to London were Bristol and Norwich, each with a population of rather under 30,000; the population of London was 500,000; there was no town except London with so large a population as that in the present day possessed by Cheltenham.

But the great manufacturing cities, which have grown up with such marvellous and, it may be said, dangerous rapidity, were either small towns, or villages little known, at the beginning of the eighteenth century. At that time Manchester was a market town with 6000 inhabitants, Leeds 7000; Sheffield a barren and uncultivated moor, with 2000; Birmingham and Liverpool with 4000 inhabitants. At the time of the census in 1861 these had increased; Liverpool to 493,346; Manchester to 357,604; Birmingham to 343,696; Leeds to 207,165; Sheffield to 207,579.

And this wonderful increase of population in the manufacturing cities, almost wholly comprises operatives and people of the poorer class, who are not able to build churches, or to provide for their maintenance themselves. From the very first, the merchants who employed them, as soon as they had made sufficient money and could afford it, built country houses for themselves and their families; they would spend the day in their country-houses, and in the evening leave the smoky atmosphere of the city for their country retreat, and leave their operatives in temporal and spiritual matters to look after themselves. We have had noble examples of church-building, and other munificent acts of charity, on the part of some of our merchant-princes; but of most it must be confessed with

sorrow, that whilst they were amassing for themselves immense fortunes, they did little or nothing in proportion to their means for the spiritual welfare of those by whose labour their wealth was obtained. It did not occur to them, as it did to our forefathers who built and endowed our Cathedrals and Parish Churches, that money brought with it a serious responsibility. Hence neither churches nor chapels were built by them; so that at the religious census of 1851 it was calculated that for Manchester 80,000 additional sittings; for Birmingham 68,000, for Liverpool 93,000, were required, in order to supply accommodation for 58 per cent. of the population.

Nor is this great lack of spiritual accommodation observable only in the manufacturing districts. According to the same census it is computed that there are in England 1,644,734 able to attend Church, wholly unprovided with the means of attending any religious service. During the last fifty years the Church has exerted herself to stem the current of Dissent and Infidelity that prevails; but all her energies are unable to keep pace, or even to prevent her from losing ground, with the ever increasing population. Thus between 1801 and 1831 there were only 428 churches built in those thirty years, whilst in the ten years between 1831 and 1841 there were 667, and in the ten

years between 1841 and 1851, there were 1197 built; yet the discouraging fact remains that in 1801 the Church afforded accommodation for 48·2 per cent., whilst in 1851 she only afforded accommodation for 29·7 of the whole population. It is clear therefore that if the number of those able to attend Church is computed at 58 per cent. the Church accommodation which in 1851 was 5,317,915, must be almost double to meet the requirements of 10,398,013 people.

But the greatest amount of spiritual destitution is to be found as might be expected, although not to the extent that prevails, in London. A few extracts from the report of the House of Lords' Committee appointed in 1858 for the purpose of inquiring into the deficiency of the means of religion in the Metropolis, will best show the almost incredible amount of irreligion which prevails there.

In the parish of Shoreditch, population 114,370, there was Church accommodation for 1 in 11, and there was one clergyman for every 7000 people.

In Stepney there was one district without any Church.

In Christ Church, Spitalfields, population 20,000; Church accommodation for 12,000; three clergymen.

In Newington, population 70,000; Church accommodation 6570; three clergymen.

In Southwark, there were 11,000 people without any Church in their district.

In Bermondsey, Clapham, Camberwell, Lambeth, and Southwark, there were 11,590 persons to each Church, and 4604 to each clergyman.

Now how are we to account for this lamentable state of spiritual destitution in the Metropolis? How did it arise? and what means have been employed to remedy what looks like, not only a national misfortune, but also a national sin?

If we go back to the time of Edward III., we find the population of London, inclusive of the suburbs, to be under 35,000, the number of Churches being 140. In 1500, the population had increased to 200,000; in 1600 to 300,000; in 1700 to nearly 480,000.

But the decrease of Churches in proportion to the population, began almost immediately after the Reformation. The endowments also of the livings had greatly diminished; whilst no less than 2374 chapelries were altogether suppressed. In 1664, it is calculated that 100,000 died of the plague, which, together with those who had fled from London, materially diminished the population. But in 1666 occurred the great fire which, together with 13,000 dwelling-houses, destroyed also 89 Parish Churches. Private subscriptions were at once raised for the purpose of rebuilding these

Churches, and by the end of the seventeenth century, London contained 95 Churches; a number, which if they had been equally distributed, would have been amply sufficient. But unfortunately the distribution was most unequal; for whilst for the intra-mural population of 72,000 there were 57 Churches, for the population outside the walls, numbering 405,000, there were only 38 Churches; in other words, one Church for every 10,684 persons.

At the commencement of the eighteenth century, scarcely a house was built on the western part of London. Chelsea was a country village of 1000 inhabitants. S. Marylebone, Finsbury, and Islington were pasture-grounds for cattle, or pleasure-grounds for sportsmen. In our days these regions are one continuous mass of houses, the residences of the aristocracy; but the focus also of irreligion and infidelity, of poverty and vice, equalling in the depth of degradation anything that can be found in Spitalfields or Whitechapel.

But in this country, which boasts an Established Church, it is reasonable to suppose that the Government would provide for the remedy of what we repeat is, not only a national misfortune, but also a national sin. Let us see what has actually been done.

In Queen Anne's reign the Government

granted a sum sufficient to build fifty Churches in the Metropolis. No care was taken as to the application of this money; no plans drawn out as to how much each Church was to cost; and ultimately, instead of fifty, only ten were built.

From that time to the beginning of this century nothing further was done by Government; the population rapidly increased, and Church accommodation proportionately decreased. But during the first quarter of this century, two grants, one of £1,000,000 and another of £500,000, were voted by Government for the erection of additional Churches in London. But here again was a recurrence of the old mismanagement: and these two grants were again miserably squandered. Half a dozen of those hideous Churches which disfigure our aristocratic neighbourhood (*e.g.* the Church of S. Marylebone), were built; instead of the money being laid out on a larger number of more architectural, and less ostentatious buildings; or, which certainly was the first thing that ought to have been done, in building and endowing Free Churches for the poor in the very centre of the lanes and alleys, and leaving the rich to provide Churches for themselves.

And this is the last the Government has done for the National Church; yet on reflec-

tion we wish we could truly say that this was the last Goverment has done. It has abolished Church rates; but that was of little moment. But if there is one Society which more than another ought to have commended itself to a Government professing to uphold an Established Church, especially under the lamentable deficiency of Churches that prevails, it is the Society for the "Enlargement and Building of Churches;" yet by the withdrawal of the Queen's letter in 1853, the funds of that Society dropped from £60,000 to £25,000; and are now reduced to £10,000. By the aid of this Society 1200 new Churches have been built; 700 restored; and 1,000,000 sittings, of which 850,500 were free, supplied; and it was the means of doing all this good, that the Government, to please a few demagogues and to gratify the clamour for religious equality, so unreasonably crippled.

Bishop Blomfield, during his Episcopate, through his own private munificence and energy, aided by the Church Building Society and private subscriptions, was enabled to consecrate in his diocese 197 Churches, with 106,000 sittings, at a cost of £536,000. But during the same period the population had increased by 600,000 souls, as it continues to increase every year, far beyond the additional supply of accommodation; so that now at least

1000 additional churches would not be too many to meet the reasonable requirements of the day.

Such a deplorable state of things sufficiently accounts for the prevalence of Nonconformity. It is not the fault of the Church, but rather of the State. The State whilst it is credited with protecting the Church, has continually hampered her action, favoured her enemies, and paved the way, not only for Nonconformity, but unhappily also Infidelity. The *Nonconformist*, if in drawing up his late statistics his imagination has somewhat led him into the regions of fiction or extravagance, spoke at least truly in his concluding advice: "The members of the Church of England with ample resources, and paramount social influence, could far more effectively serve the interests of their own communions, and extend their religious agencies, by freeing themselves from Government control, and like all other denominations rely exclusively upon their own inherent zeal and energy for the support of their religious institutions."

No doubt;—but how would the State fare?

Under the circumstances, Nonconformity in England at the present day has been a necessity; but when all things are taken into consideration, the wonder is, not that it has done so much, but

that it has not done more. How many different bodies of Nonconformists there are, who can tell? When we compare therefore the respective numbers of Church and Dissent, the question ought to be, not what proportion all these sects combined bear; but what proportion each one separately bears to the Established Church.

But the Church has no reason to fear comparison even with the combined forces of Nonconformity. But here a difficulty arises; for the census of 1851, and in a greater degree that lately published in the *Nonconformist* are so palpably inaccurate, that it is impossible to arrive at any proximate calculation. Both in 1861 and 1871 the Dissenters protested against a religious census. The *Nonconformist*, states that that protest was made against "an ecclesiastical counting of noses;" nor does any one except the Editor of the *Nonconformist* doubt, that the number of attendants at church or chapel is more reliable than the number of sittings, for the simple reason that seats in church, and we may suppose in chapel also, may be and often are unoccupied. But there is every reason for believing that during the last twenty years, Nonconformity has lost ground; and if we conclude that at present it constitutes one-third, and the Church two-thirds of the population, we shall not be far wrong; or, if

we are, the error will be in favour of Nonconformity rather than of the Church.

It is amongst the lower middle classes and the small tradespeople who can afford, and indeed prefer to pay for pews, that the whole success of Dissent lies. The lanes and alleys of the metropolis and of large cities, as well as the care of schools, and the systematic visiting of the poor, it leaves to the Church; and with reason; because in such places, and in the performance of such duties as cannot buy its service, the Voluntary system cannot exist. But Nonconformists when they advocate Disestablishment (by which they mean Disendowment also), should remember that it is amongst the rich who do not value Dissent, and the poor who cannot pay, that an Established Church is of so great value as labouring in a sphere which Voluntaryism cannot reach. They should remember also another thing; viz., that if the Church were freed from the shackles with which the State fetters her, and could put forth those ample resources to that paramount social influence which even the *Nonconformist*" allows that she possesses, the contest would be more unequal than it is at present; so that through the plan advocated by the Liberationists, it would be Nonconformity and not the Church which would eventually suffer.

Chapter VII.

ROMANISM.

THERE are some people who seem to think it a religious duty to abuse the Roman Church. And these people are indeed Rome's best friends; for there is nothing so calculated to produce the opposite purpose to that which is intended, than violent abuse and misguided opposition. Such people must know, if they would only think, that nothing is so wholly bad as to have no redeeming quality; in fact, error itself is only the perversion of truth, and therefore must bear some resemblance to the truth which it perverts. And so it is with Romanism (for that religion, as it exists in England, we cannot designate Roman Catholicism). Rome no doubt has departed widely from primitive faith, and has fallen into both heresy and schism; by thinking to excommunicate others, she has cut herself off from the Anglican and Eastern Churches. But to represent her as wholly and essentially bad, is not only false, but dangerous.

The Rome of the present day comes before us

as a true, though erring branch of the Catholic Church; a branch which but for her errors would, more than any other, enlist our respect and affection, as having been founded by SS. Peter and Paul, and as having been the See of the former; a branch of the Church which derived a special dignity from Rome, the seat of empire and the capital of the world; which during the time of persecution bore the burden and heat of the day, and witnessed boldly to the faith by the blood of the martyrs; which during the Arian, Nestorian, Macedonian, and Eutychian controversies remained untainted with heresy; whilst at a later time she stood out as an oasis in the desert, against the universal darkness and irreligion which prevailed in Christendom; and to which we owe a particular debt of gratitude for the re-establishment, or at any rate the confirmation, of religion in our land through the mission of S. Augustine.

And what is the consequence of the reckless and absurd abuse which we are always hearing of Rome? People perhaps think, that to instil a pious horror of Rome into the minds of their children is the best and surest way to defeat Romanism and promote Protestantism. Experience teaches the reverse. It is an established fact that the children of such people, when they come to years to think and judge for themselves, are the very persons who become Ro-

manists; and that of the most distinguished amongst those who have become converts to Rome, the greater part had been brought up after the strictest and narrowest sect of Protestantism. And what wonder? In religion, as in everything else, the most violent opponents of what they don't understand, as soon as they have reason to change their opinion, become the most enthusiastic admirers. So, people who have been taught to believe everything bad of Rome, are taken off their guard, when they find Rome is not so bad as was represented. Skilful Roman controversialists contrast their vaunted union with our exaggerated divisions; the contrast to those ignorant of the real character of the Roman Church, seems so reasonable on their side, so unanswerable on ours, that people often take a leap in the dark at once. Or if before taking the final step, they demand time to consider and inquire for themselves, and on inquiry find all vagueness and disorder, where they had expected nothing but union and order; then again they are told of a power in the Church superior to Church, Council, or Creeds; and that any apparent changes which from time to time have occurred,—and especially is this the case with regard to the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin and Papal Infallibility—are not to be accounted innovations or additions to the faith, but simply as later deve-

lopments of everlasting truths, which only awaited the authority of the Supreme Head of the Church to decree them as doctrines.

Such assertions, incapable as they are of proof, and opposed to fact, with of course other equally reckless assertions with regard to the Anglican Church, have been and still are the staple arguments of Rome, and their plan for leading captive silly people. It is as well not to close our eyes to arguments which, however weak, have so often misled others, especially as a mere recourse to facts at once dispels those plausible illusions.

It is clear that from the first, Churches founded by the Apostles, amongst which Tertullian enumerates Corinth, Philippi, Thessalonica, Ephesus, and Rome, were held in special honour. The Bishops of Rome, Alexandria, and Antioch, as presiding over Apostolic Churches, and at a later period Jerusalem also, enjoyed a precedence, not of authority or jurisdiction, but of dignity, over the bishops. These sees were called Patriarchates, and the first place of dignity was awarded to Rome, as the seat of the Roman Empire. To these Patriarchates belonged the duty of consecrating bishops, and of settling disputes within their jurisdiction. But from the first there were certain sees, both in the East and in the West,

which were autocephalous or independent, amongst which were the Churches of Britain, Spain, and Gaul, which constituted the prefecture of Gaul.

But when Constantine removed the seat of Government to Byzantium, then Constantinople was admitted into the number of Patriarchates, and enjoyed, as being the seat of the imperial residence, the second place of dignity after Rome. This dignity was conceded by Constantine himself, and was afterwards confirmed by the Council of Constantinople.

During the first three centuries, next to nothing is known of Ecclesiastical Rome; in fact, we are told that before the Council of Nice, Rome was considered of small repute. Even the names of its bishops are a matter of doubt; we see their likenesses and read their names on the walls of the Basilica of S. Paolo fuori le mura at Rome; but the only authority for their existence is derived from the false decretals of Isidore, which purposed to give the early history of the Roman Church and its supremacy over the world; but at the present day, even amongst Romanists, these decretals are allowed to be a forgery.

But from the little that is known of her former history, the following events show conclusively that Rome had no special authority over other Churches, and was only on an

equality with the other particular branches of the Catholic Church.

In A.D. 158, a dispute having arisen between the Eastern and Western Churches as to the proper time for observing Easter, the former following the Jewish custom, the latter keeping it on the Sunday following the Passover, Polycarp the Bishop of Smyrna consulted Anicetus Bishop of Rome, on the subject. Polycarp cited SS. John and Philip: Anicetus SS. Peter and Paul, as his authorities; but as they came to no agreement, they parted without any ill feeling, or any question being raised as to one bishop being superior to the other.

The same controversy arose again A.D. 196, but was carried on in a very different temper, and with a different result. Victor Bishop of Rome, thought to compel the Eastern Church to confirm to the Western practice of observing Easter, and accordingly wrote an imperious letter to the Asiatic bishops ordering them to conform. Polycrates, Bishop of Ephesus, answered in the name of the other bishops, and charitably, although firmly, refused to abandon their own practice. Thereupon Victor excommunicated them; but the Asiatic bishops neither heeded the excommunication nor altered their custom; nor was the matter finally settled till the Council of Nice.

The next occasion on which the Eastern and

Western Churches were brought in contact, was A.D. 250 in regard to those who had lapsed at the time of the Decian persecution. The clergy of Rome entirely approved of the conduct of Cyprian Bishop of Carthage as to the reception of the lapsed to Communion, if they were in danger of death; but they arrogated to themselves no superiority, and Cyprian writes to them as their equal.

Again, A.D. 254, Faustinus, Bishop of Lyons, together with the Gallican bishops, wrote to Cyprian, Bishop of Carthage, and to Stephen, Bishop of Rome, to consult them as to the treatment of the Bishop of Arles, who had joined the Novatian heresy. Cyprian thereupon wrote to Stephen, to consult him as to what steps they ought to take in the matter; at the same time he acknowledges that "pro magnitudine suâ Roma Carthaginem debet præcedere;" as also because it was the see of S. Peter and the principal Church. Although the result of this communication is not known, it is clear Cyprian treated Stephen as his equal, but, from the importance and dignity of his bishopric, as "primus inter pares." On another occasion Cyprian wrote to some Spanish bishops, urging them to disregard an opinion given by the Bishop of Rome.

In the following year a very important controversy arose between the two Churches as to

rebaptizing heretics, the Eastern Church rebaptizing, the Western Church receiving them back simply by the imposition of hands. Cyprian convened several Councils, at which the Asiatic and African bishops agreed that heretics ought to be rebaptized, and the results of these councils he sent to Stephen. He knew that Stephen differed from him, but he wrote to him as an equal, and without claiming the right to dictate, he asserts the right of every Church to make rules for itself. Thereupon Stephen convened a Synod, and excommunicated the African bishops. Firmilianus, Bishop of Cæsarea, afterwards canonized as a Saint, and no mean authority, states that by this act Stephen was guilty of schism, and separated not these Churches, but himself from them; he accuses him of arrogating to himself a superiority from holding the see of S. Peter, plainly intimating that such a claim was inadmissible; whilst Cyprian expressly denies such a superiority, for in a Council attended by eighty-seven bishops, he says: "Neque enim quisquam nostrum episcopum se esse episcoporum constituit, aut tyrannico terrore ad obsequendi necessitatem Collegas suos adigit, quando habeat omnis episcopus pro licentiâ libertatis et potestatis suæ arbitrium proprium."

A.D. 341. The Council of Sardica decreed that the Bishops of Rome had the right to

order the causes of bishops, whom they considered to have been unjustly tried, to be heard over again; this decree, although rejected by the African bishops, no doubt laid in no small degree the foundation of Rome's demands for universal supremacy.

But that the pretensions of Rome for jurisdiction beyond its own patriarchate were not recognised up to the fifth century is clear, not only from the decree of the Council of Ephesus, which forbade Patriarchs to assume jurisdiction beyond their own limits; but also from the claims to equality put forth by the Patriarch of Constantinople, and the decree of the Council of Chalcedon, which decided upon the equality of the two bishops, not only in dignity but also in authority.

The early system of Ecclesiastical government was attended with constant disputes between Constantinople and Rome, and was fraught with great danger and mischief to the Church. The see of Constantinople was rapidly increasing in strength and influence; the Bishops of Alexandriaand Antioch acknowledged his supremacy in the East; and in the sixth century the Patriarch of Constantinople claimed, and the Emperor conferred on him, the title of Œcumenical or Universal Bishop. It is curious to observe that Gregory the Great stigmatises the assumption of this title, which

was afterwards claimed by the Bishop of Rome, as unchristian and profane, whilst at the same time he entreats the Patriarch, *not to violate that equality which is the essence of the Episcopate.*

But there was no possibility of a reconciliation between the Churches, and every year the controversy grew more bitter. Disputes were constantly arising. In the eighth century broke out the Iconoclastic Controversy, only to be followed by one still greater in the eleventh century, respecting the Procession of the Holy Ghost. Both Churches agreed as to the doctrine: the question was as to whether any change should be made in the Nicene Creed. Neither Church would give way. In 1053 the Pope excommunicated the Patriarch of Constantinople; whilst in the following year, a Council was held at Constantinople, and the Patriarch excommunicated the Pope. And then began the unhappy schism which divides the Eastern and Western Churches at the present time.

The commencement of the Papacy, and its claims for supremacy, date from the time of Gregory the Great. To remedy the prevailing irreligion, the tyranny of kings, the lawlessness of the aristocracy, and the general licentiousness of the people, and as the means of promoting the general civilization of Europe, Gregory conceived the grand idea, that as

there was one universal empire, so there ought also to be the moral supremacy of one ecclesiastical dominion: a Theocracy, radiating from Rome as its centre, with one visible Head, over the whole world. It was no doubt partly with a view to the foundation of such a Church that he sent S. Augustine into England. The idea of a united Christendom under a spiritual dominion was a grand conception; all the more grand, because on the part of Gregory it was disinterested, for he disclaimed for himself the title of Papa Universalis, and professed to be "servus servorum Dei."

Far different was the conduct of his successors. Slowly but persistently the Popes increased the claims put forth by Gregory.

Boniface III., the next successor but one to Gregory, assumed the title of Universal Bishop.

In the reign of Leo II., A.D. 682, Popes were first elected without the consent of the Emperor being first obtained.

Constantine I. deposed the Emperor for pulling down the images in the church.

Gregory II. excommunicated the Emperor Leo Isauricus, and absolved his subjects from their allegiance.

Zacharius deposed Childeric and gave his crown to Pepin; in return for which Pepin bestowed on the Papacy the territory of

Ravenna, thus laying the foundation of Rome's temporal power.

From the time of Charlemagne, who was crowned by the Pope as Roman Emperor, the power and jurisdiction of the Papacy became very widely extended, the Popes henceforward claiming the power of transferring kingdoms at their pleasure.

A.D. 884 a decree was made by Pope Adrian that the election of the Pope no longer required the confirmation of the Emperor.

By the time of Hildebrand A.D. 1073, the power of the Papacy had advanced with rapid strides, and under him it began to be developed in its full strength. Instead of the spiritual dominion which Gregory the Great had endeavoured to establish, Hildebrand claimed for the Papacy a control over the temporal as well as the spiritual welfare of the world; and henceforward, instead of the election of the Pope requiring the confirmation of the Emperor, the election of the Emperor required the confirmation of the Pope.

Under Innocent III., A.D. 1198, the temporal, as well as the spiritual supremacy of the Papacy reached its culminating point. Now the Pope declares himself to be the Vicar of Christ, the Ruler of the World, and to be vested with personal Infallibility. Princes were to kiss his feet; to him belonged the right to depose

bishops; to make, and depose, and excommunicate emperors, and absolve their subjects from their allegiance. Ecclesiastical persons were no longer to be brought before lay tribunals, and all civil causes were to be submitted to ecclesiastical courts. And these rights were not only claimed but acceded to.

Dean Milman thus describes the character of Innocent: "His high and blameless, and, in some respects, wise and gentle character, seems to approach more nearly than any one of the whole succession of Roman bishops, to the ideal light of the supreme Pontiff." And it must be allowed that his power was generally exercised on the side of right and justice. In the case of Philip of France, Innocent espoused the cause of an injured wife against a tyrannical husband. And Philip, when his land was placed under an interdict, and living and dead alike were denied the offices of the Church, obeyed his orders. In the case of John of England, he espoused the cause of liberty against tyranny. John, after vainly protesting against the unlawfulness of Innocent's conduct, under sentence of excommunication and fear of a French invasion, acknowledged the Pope as his liege-lord, and resigned his crown into his hands. Germany and Italy, and even Constantinople, felt his power and acknowledged his authority.

Nor did the influence of the Papacy suffer any diminution under Gregory IX., an old man of more than eighty years at the time of his election; but who in his incessant conflicts with the powerful Emperor Frederick II. put forth all the authority and power which was exercised by Hildebrand or Innocent.

But a greater triumph than any which it had yet achieved was in store for the Papacy. Under Clement IV. it became triumphant over its hereditary foe, the house of Hohenstaufen, the last member of which perished on a scaffold at Naples, a victim of the fierce and implacable hatred of the Pope. And thus ended, in the victory of the Papacy, the contest which had for so long a time and with such various results been carried on between the spiritual and temporal powers, between the Papacy and the Empire.

The time of Boniface VIII., about A.D. 1300, may be considered at once the climax of the greatness and the commencement of the fall of the Papacy. At his election, the Kings of Hungary and Sicily held the reins of his horse as he rode to the Lateran. Many of his predecessors had been men of great learning and piety. Boniface, a thoroughly immoral and unscrupulous man, shared their ambition, but lacked the ability necessary for carrying it out. Philip the Fair, King of France, set himself

openly to curbing the insolence of the Pontiff; in retaliation, the Pope issued the famous Bull "unam sanctam," which claimed the subjection of kings and every human being to the see of Rome; and excommunicated the king. Philip burnt the Bull, and sent an ambassador to bring the Pope prisoner to Lyons; he was however rescued by the people of Anagni; but he died within a month in consequence of refusing food for two days from fear of poison; or, according to another account, from a fit of ungoverned rage and anguish of mind.

From this time, owing to the avarice and immorality of Popes and clergy, the power of the Papacy began to decline. Benedict XI. rescinded the Bulls issued by Boniface. In 1305 the Papacy was removed to Avignon, where it continued for seventy years: during that time the Popes became entirely dependent on the kings of France; in Italy there sprung up a strong feeling of discontent; and the increasing power of the Ghibelline, or Anti-papal party, began to weaken and undermine the authority of the Pope. After seventy years the Papacy was brought back to Rome, and shortly afterwards the great schism of the West began, and for nearly fifty years the Roman Church had two or three Popes at the same time.

On all sides a reformation was called for. In

vain the Council of Pisa deposed the two rival Popes Clement VII. and Urban VI., and elected Alexander V. in their place; the result was that now, instead of two, there were three Popes. In vain, five years afterwards, the Council of Constance assembled to reform the abuses and immorality of the Popes, and to subordinate them to General Councils; the opposition of the Cardinals, and the jealousy of the members of the Council, prevented a reformation being effected. A third Council assembled at Basle, A.D. 1433, with no better result; the Pope declared himself superior to Councils, and transferred it to Rome. The Council of Trent was summoned by Paul III. in 1545; but it was too late to stem the discontent and hatred of the Papacy that existed; moreover it was purely a Roman Council, under the Pope's Legate. A general Council which was rendered impossible by the insolence and arbitrary conduct of Rome, might, if properly and canonically held, have proved successful; but the Popes hated and feared General Councils; and therefore there was only one possible remedy, and that was *the Reformation.*

From the above short analysis of the history of the Church of Rome to the time of the Reformation, the four following points may be deduced:

1st. That the Church of Rome in the earliest ages of the Church, although she had a priority of dignity, had no priority of authority over other Patriarchates.

2nd. That the supremacy exercised by her over the Western Churches from the time of Gregory the Great was usurped, inasmuch as it did not belong to her originally, nor was conferred upon her by any General Council. Moreover, that this usurped supremacy of Rome has been the most fruitful source of evil to the Church, and is the great obstacle to the Union of Christendom at the present day.

3rd. That the Church of Rome has no greater right to be called *the* Catholic Church, than the Greek and Anglican Churches, but like them is only *a particular branch* of the Catholic Church.

4th. That Rome's vaunted assertions of her unity are ungrounded, for that since the eleventh century she has always been separated from Christendom, and frequently disunited within herself.

Romanists in the present day make assertions as to their supremacy and unity which they are not able, and seem not to care, to prove. Yet, although a very slight acquaintance with Church history suffices to expose their unfounded pretensions, it should be remembered that the burden of proof rests with them, and

not their disproof with us. It is not, in ordinary matters, usual to accept preposterous assertions, unsupported by evidence, as sufficient to establish a claim. No Church, except Rome, has ever laid claim to such a supremacy; is it not reasonable that she should carry her credentials with her? And if there has been one Church from the beginning, is it not reasonable to believe that it was the Church of Jerusalem?

If we turn to the Bible, we find there nothing that would lead us to believe that the government of the Church was ever intended to be vested in one universal bishop. Under the Old Dispensation, when God appointed the various offices and duties, he also laid down rules for the continuance of the High Priest. Is it likely that with regard to the Christian Church, which He sent His own Son from heaven to found, He would have given less explicit injunctions if it had been His will to appoint one supreme earthly Head? Would He have instituted so doubtfully and indefinitely a power which was to have jurisdiction over all the Churches of the world; nay, to which it belonged to make and depose sovereigns, to be monarch of monarchs, and vicegerent of Christ?

Our Saviour nowhere appointed one, but twelve to be Apostles. Nor did the Apostles

appoint such a form of Church Government. And yet they were most minute in the laws they prescribe for the government of the various Churches. They lay down express injunctions for the regulation of ecclesiastical matters; for the remedy of heresy and schism, and for the preservation of the truth. Each Church is written to as having complete authority to regulate its own affairs; and no allusion is made as to its being subject to any other Church; it is ordered to obey kings, but there is no mention made of one spiritual Head on earth. Neither our Saviour, nor His Apostles, nor the early Church, nor any General Council, instituted such a supremacy.

On the contrary we find the Fathers of the Church expressly condemning such a dignity, as "episcopus episcoporum," or "episcopus universalis." Tertullian describes the unity of the Church as consisting "conscientiâ religionis, et disciplinæ unitate, et spei fœdere." S. Cyprian says, "erant cæteri Apostoli quod fuit Petrus, pari consortio prædíti et honoris et potestatis." A Roman cardinal confesses, "Petrus nihil plus potestatis a Christo recepit aliis Apostolis."

The Anglican Church deeply deplores the disunion of Christendom; but the fault lies with Rome and not with us. It was Rome's unscriptural and uncatholic claim of supremacy

which was her ruin under the Empire, and has been the bane of Christendom ever since. She reflects upon the unhappy divisions of our Church; she forgets how disunited she is herself. She throws doubts upon our Orders; she forgets that many of her objections recoil upon herself. It would be well if she would abandon fiction and resort to fact. If she could only be induced to listen to reason, Christendom, as is devoutly to be wished, might be reunited.

> "Quam tua pervideas oculis mala lippus inunctis,
> Cur in amicorum vitiis tam cernis acutum
> Quam aut aquila, aut serpens Epidaurius? At tibi contra
> Evenit, inquirant vitia ut tua rursus et illi."

But Ultramontanism, not Catholicism, is the religion of modern Rome. Every religious question is decided; every Canon of the Church is observed or controverted, not according to Catholic usage or ecclesiastical precedent, but according to present expediency, as interpreted by the sole and irresistible will of the Pope; and it is not too much to say that there is no voice on earth, no advice of his bishops, no words of counsel, however wise, raised in opposition to his preconcerted plans, even though it be in Synod professedly convened for the purpose of deliberation, which

would restrain or influence the Pope in anything which he might think fit to do, or in any Article of Faith which he might determine to decree in his government of the Church.

Chapter VIII.

THE REFORMATION.

THAT a religious Reformation of some kind was needed in the sixteenth century, not even Romanists deny. On the Continent a feeling of discontent had long shown itself against the arrogance and vice of the Papacy. "Never," says Erasmus, "was there a time when Popes and Prelates were so corrupt." Dr. Newman speaking of those mediæval times says: "had we lived in such deplorable times, when Satan seems to have been loosed at the end of his thousand years, we should have asked whether it was conceivable that the Church would ever revive from the abyss into which it was sunk."

The Republican commotion in Rome which, beginning with Arnold of Brescia, and ending with the conspiracy of Pocaro, had for three centuries agitated the city, were attributable in the first instance to the extravagant pretentions of the Papacy, and sought the subjection of the Pope no less than that of the Emperor.

At the commencement of the sixteenth century the state both of the regular and secular

clergy (even if we discredit the greater scandals alleged against them) as well as of the laity, had become thoroughly degraded through ignorance, superstition, and depravity; whilst the immorality of the Papacy culminated in the person of Alexander VI., a Pope who combined in his own person the office of Supreme Head, as well as the model of supreme wickedness, in the world.

To attribute the Reformation in England to the sale of Indulgences by Tetzel, or to the divorce of Henry VIII., is to attribute to accidental causes an event which had been long expected, and had become at length inevitable. The time had arrived which was particularly adapted to a better state of things. The invention of printing and the consequent increase of knowledge; the translation of the Bible by Wickliffe; the preaching of Luther; to which we may add the long pent-up hostility felt in England to the supremacy of Rome, which was no doubt greatly increased by the sale of Indulgences; all these things were means by which the eyes of the people were opened to the moral degradation in which they had long been sunk; people were enabled to read and understand for themselves that Rome had corrupted the primitive Faith, and had engrafted false doctrine on the once pure religion of the land; and that moreover she had usurped an

authority and a supremacy, to which she had no right and no title.

The object of the Reformation in England was to weed out the errors which had crept into the Church during the Middle Ages, and to restore the pure Catholicism of the primitive times of the Church. That this, and not the rejection of Catholicism, was its object, is shown in the "Apologia," the first great theological work after the Reformation, in which Jewel accuses the Roman Church of having fallen away from Patristic teaching. The object in England, therefore, was the opposite of that of the foreign Reformation, the latter being, not to revive the old, but to introduce a new religion. Separation not from Rome, but from Rome's errors, was what England desired. To quote the words of Hooker: "The indisposition of the Church of Rome to reform herself must be no stay unto us from paying our duty to God: even as desire for retaining communion with her could be no excuse if we did not perform our duty; so far as lawfully we may, we have held, and do hold, fellowship with her. For as the Apostle doth say of Israel, that they are in one respect enemies, but in another beloved of God; in like sort, with Rome we dare not communicate touching her grievous abomination, yet touching those main points, wherein they constantly still persist, we

gladly acknowledge them to be of the family of Jesus Christ?"

But was the Reformation in England a schismatical act? The answer to this depends upon the answer that can be given to another question, Was the Anglican Church an independent branch of the Catholic Church?

If the Church of England was not an independent Church; if her Succession were derived from Rome; then her separation from Rome at the Reformation would be an act of schism; then her commission would fail; her Orders, and Sacraments, and Formularies at the present day would be schismatical. But if she were originally an independent branch of the Church, then her local intercommunion (to borrow the line of argument once used by a well-known Romanist) with other Churches, however desirable it might be as a sign of that love which ought to exist among Christians, is not essential; for intercommunion is not local, but doctrinal; and in every independent Church Communion consists in its having the Apostolical succession and Apostolical doctrine; in other words, an independent Church does not commit schism by separating from any particular Church, but from Christendom at large; and Catholicity, not Rome, is the essence of a Church.

Was, then, the Anglican an independent Church?

How Christianity was first introduced into Britain, is not known for certain; although we have the testimony of Clement of Rome, Eusebius, and Theodoret, that it was through one of the Apostles, and probably S. Paul. Tertullian mentions that Christianity was introduced into Britain in the second century. We know from the fact of there being at the present day at least two British churches of the second century, S. Martin's at Canterbury, and S. Mary's in the Castle, Dover; and from a more ancient church even than these having, as it is more than probable, existed at Glastonbury; from the fact of there having been British bishops present at the Councils of Arles and Nice; that Christianity existed in England before the arrival of S. Augustine; nay, from the British mode of observing Easter, there is reason for believing that its introduction was from the East rather than from the West. But that A.D. 596 we are indebted to Rome and to Pope Gregory for the Mission of S. Augustine to England, there can be no doubt; but it is not true that there was at that time no Church in England. As we have seen in a previous chapter, the Church of Britain, together with those of Gaul and Spain, was an autocephalous Church in the prefecture of

Gaul. Bertha, the wife of King Ethelbert, was a Christian, and daughter of a Christian, Clotaire King of the Franks. She maintained a bishop, Luidhardus, and they had a Church at Canterbury, the capital of Ethelbert's kingdom. Offa, a Saxon Prince, was a Christian. Several bishops had visited England in the sixth century. There were English bishops and an English Liturgy, and the people were particularly tenacious of their independence.

But any danger that might have arisen on the ground of the English dislike to interference, was averted by the timely wisdom of Gregory. In order not to arouse their susceptibilities, and thus impede the hopes of success, Gregory advised Augustine that the heathen chapels that existed should be washed with holy water, and converted into Christian churches; that the English should retain their own forms and their own Liturgy, the terms of intercommunion being Baptism, and the observance of Easter according to the Western custom.

Theodore was nominated by the Pope, and consecrated Archbishop of Canterbury, A.D. 668. He no doubt brought the Church of England into nearer conformity with Rome, yet the two Churches, owing to the great distance and the dangerous journey between them, remained independent; and there is abundance of authority to show that the

supremacy of Rome was not at that time received in England, an unsuccessful attempt at which was made in the case of Bishop Wilfred.

But by the time of the Norman Conquest, the state of things was altered. Intercourse between the two countries, which in the time of Gregory I., might have been advantageous, became more frequent; and unfortunately Rome had lapsed from primitive simplicity into mediævalism, and had become corrupt. Pilgrimages, as before to Jerusalem, were now made to Rome, and not unfrequently were enjoined as Penances; and the pilgrims, although they brought back much to edify, would bring back also many of the corruptions of that Church. Bishops from England often crossed the Alps, and went to Rome for the purpose of visiting the sepulchres of SS. Peter and Paul. On those occasions they would naturally take counsel with the Bishops and Priests in that city. By degrees these journeys, which were at first voluntary, became compulsory. The Roman Curia was established. Rome, from being consulted, now forced her advice on these foreign bishops; next, she compelled them to resort to Rome for their confirmation; and thus by encroaching little by little on the episcopal independence of England; she went to the length of abolishing

altogether the Provincial Synods, and transferred the authority of the Metropolitan to her own Legate.

At this time the spiritual power of Rome was at its height, and it was not likely that the great influence she exercised over the Councils of the world would not in time be extended to England. About this time Hildebrand, the founder, as he may be called, of the Papal system, become Pope. His boldness in excommunicating the Emperor, and citing him to appear before him, shows the extent of the jurisdiction which the Pope not only claimed, but exercised.

It was after the Norman Conquest that the Papacy began to be felt as a power in England. Stigand, the English Archbishop, was removed to make way for Lanfranc, an Italian; and William himself asked the assistance of Rome towards remodelling the English Church. William, however, was still able to maintain his own authority, and to refuse homage to the Pope for his kingdom; but it was only because Hildebrand's hands were tied by his contest with the Emperor and the claims of a rival Pope; but the quarrels between the clergy and laity, and the separation of the Civil from the Ecclesiastical Courts had made a breach, and the Pope only awaited his opportunity to step in.

William Rufus also asserted his own rights, and banished Anselm for obeying the Pope instead of obeying him; he indeed renounced the right of Investiture, but he compelled the bishops to do homage for their temporalities. A similar right of receiving homage from the Abbots and Bishops, although refused to the Emperor, was conceded by the Pope to Henry I.

But before long the Pope had fully established his power in England. A Legate was appointed as the locum tenens of the Pope, who usurped the rights of the Archbishops and Bishops in their Provincial and Diocesan Synods; when a dispute arose between the Legate and a Bishop the decision was referred to the Pope; and thus the Pope, having become the arbiter in ecclesiastical causes, became in no great length of time the judge in matrimonial causes also, and decided questions of divorce and the legitimacy of children.

Thus was the Church of England—at first a free and independent branch of the Catholic Church—by degrees brought, and not so much through the fault of its clergy as by the tyranny and oppression of the kings, under the complete supremacy of Rome; a supremacy which reached its culminating point in the reign of Henry II., when the English king was forced to walk barefooted, and dressed in sackcloth

to do Penance at the tomb of S. Thomas at Canterbury; or when John, under the ban of excommunication, surrendered his throne to the See of Rome.

It is evident that the Church of England was originally an independent Church, and that the supremacy of Rome was usurped. England therefore could not have been guilty of schism in liberating herself from that usurped supremacy at the Reformation.

But Romanists, although they admit that there were many abuses and superstitions which called for reform, assert that these were greatly exaggerated, and did not need such a strong measure as separation, or the violent changes effected by the Reformation. It has been already observed that the Church of Rome had become corrupt; that without the sanction of any General Council or Œcumenical authority, she had introduced practices and doctrines opposed to primitive Faith; it remains to inquire what those doctrines were; when and how they were introduced into the Church; and whether they were of such a character as to necessitate the stringent means adopted by England at the Reformation.

Firstly: Communion in one kind. Cardinal Bona allows that anciently all people, clergy and laity alike, received in both kinds. For

twelve centuries this had been the custom of the Church. There is no doubt that the alteration from the ancient practice arose out of a reverential feeling, and a fear lest some of the Sacred Blood should be spilt upon the ground, or run down upon the clothes of the recipient; but the alteration was not sanctioned before A.D. 1414 by the Council of Constance, which has not the least authority for being considered a General Council.

Secondly: Purgatory. It must be clearly understood what this doctrine is which prevailed in the Roman Church, and which our Church was obliged to condemn at the Reformation. It is the *Romish* doctrine that existed before the Council of Trent which is condemned in the Articles; for the Council of Trent was held after those Articles were published; moreover, in the doctrine, as expounded by that Council, there is nothing un-Catholic. The Council of Trent asserts: "There is a Purgatory, and the souls detained there are helped by the prayers of the faithful, and particularly by the sacrifices of the acceptable Altar." Nor again, can any exception be taken to the words of Bellarmine: "Purgatory is a certain place in which, as in a prison, the souls are purified after this life, which were not fully purged in this life, that so they may be able to enter into Heaven, where no unclean thing enters." This

is only what is comformable with the doctrine of the Intermediate State, as derived from the Book of Revelation, and is the doctrine expressed in our Church Militant Prayer, and the Order for the Burial of the Dead. But, according to the Romish doctrine, Purgatory is the same as Hell, except in its duration, which is uncertain, sometimes extending to thousands of years; and in it, the righteous as well as the wicked are punished. Now the Catholic doctrine of the Intermediate State is quite different from this Romish doctrine of Purgatory. Justin Martyr says: "the souls of the righteous rest in some better place, the unrighteous and wicked in a worse, awaiting the time of judgment." The abode of the righteous in this State is called Paradise, as our Lord called it to the penitent thief: "to-day shalt thou be with me in Paradise:" or Hades, or Hell, as it is termed in the Apostles' Creed, "He descended into Hell," as descriptive of the place where the Soul of our Saviour remained for those three days between his Death and Resurrection. Tertullian describes it as "a place of Divine happiness, destined for receiving the spirits of the Just." And so Prayers for the Dead, which are both primitive and sanctioned by our Church, do not bear reference to the pains of Purgatory, for we find in ancient liturgies, that such prayers were

offered for Apostles and Martyrs, and even the Blessed Virgin Herself; "for the all-holy, Immaculate, our highly blessed Lady, Mother of God, and ever Virgin, Mary."

Thirdly: Indulgences. These originally meant the relaxation of some Penances inflicted for sin; in time they came, in the Romish Church, to confer the remission of Purgatory. Not even Romanists contend that they have the sanction of scriptural or ecclesiastical authority previous to the end of the twelfth century. But they assert that Indulgences are included in the commission given by our Saviour to His Apostles to forgive and retain sin; and that the Pope, and through him his agents, by the power of the Keys, have the right to grant Indulgences out of the works of supererogation from the merits of Christ, the Blessed Mother of God, the Saints and all the Elect; that freedom from Purgatory is granted according to the time for which they are granted; and a fixed tariff is kept of the nature of the offence, and the price at which the Indulgence can be obtained. Accordingly, it is no uncommon thing to find in continental churches Privileged Altars, where it is advertised that souls may be delivered by the performance of certain Masses.

Fourthly: Transubstantiation. This is explained by the Council of Trent: "by the Con-

secration of the Bread and Wine is made a change of the whole substance of Bread into the substance of the Body of Christ, and of the whole substance of the Wine into the substance of His Blood." The doctrine seems to have been first taught by a monk about the middle of the ninth century; but the word Transubstantiation was not coined, nor did the doctrine become an article of Faith, till the Lateran Council, A.D. 1215, under Innocent III. This doctrine is different to that received by the Anglican and Greek Churches. Even Calvin believed in a Real Presence. The Church of England holds a literally, true, and Real Presence; not local, but super-local, for "Christ is in heaven, not here;" not on the Altar corporally; nor, on the other hand, only subjectively, but objectively, and independently of the recipient; and therefore He is to be worshipped on the Altar, although no worship is due to the sacramental bread and wine. For this we have no less an authority than Bishop Andrewes: "Christ Himself, the Inward Part of the Sacrament, in and with the Sacrament, apart from and out of the Sacrament, wherever He is, is to be worshipped." We accept and believe this to be primitive, whereas the Romish doctrine has only been in that Church since the thirteenth century.

Fifthly: The worship or adoration as well of

images as of relics. Against such worship we have the authority of S. Augustine at the end of the fourth century. Again of Gregory the Great in the sixth century. A Council held at Constantinople A.D. 745, which was approved by Greeks, but rejected by Latins, condemned the use of images. But the second Council of Nice, which was not a General Council, reversed the decree of the Council of Constantinople, and decreed that images should be placed in churches, but Latria should not be offered them. The doctrine about A.D. 800, but not before, was received by the Church of Rome; at the same time it was strongly opposed by Charlemagne. As an excuse for the image worship that had prevailed, the Council of Trent thus explained the doctrine: "by means of the images which we kiss and bow down before, we adore Christ and reverence the saints, whose likenesses they bear."

Sixthly: Clerical celibacy. We read in the Bible that S. Peter was a married man. Eusebius says that he was a witness of his wife's martyrdom, and he exhorted her to firmness; whilst Clemens of Alexandria speaks of his having a daughter. We learn also from Eusebius, and SS. Ignatius and Chrysostom confirm the testimony, that S. Paul was married. Indeed, Ambrose says that all the Apostles were married. S. Philip one of the seven Deacons,

was a married man. S. Paul mentions as one requisite of a bishop, that he should be "the husband of one wife." The doctrine of clerical celibacy was not established in the Roman Church before the Pontificate of Hildebrand.

Other instances of corrupt practices and doctrines which Rome had introduced into the Church might be adduced. Enough has been said to show that, as the Anglican Church had the right of an independent Church, so, in consequence, the duty was imposed upon her of reforming herself from the errors of Rome, and remodelling the Church after the pattern of Primitive and Apostolic times.

A Reformation of some sort was necessary; and on the whole we have reason to be thankful for its results. For in the hands of such thoroughly unscrupulous men as Henry VIII., Cranmer, and the Protector Somerset, we might have been cut off from the Catholic Church. Instead of Catholics, we might have become Wickliffites, or Zwinglians, or Calvinists, or Cranmerites. But we steered safely through all these dangers; and if in parts our formularies savour too much of Geneva, yet it is a cause of thankfulness, although it is one of wonder also, that the Erastianism at that time prevalent in high places was prevented from doing violence to the great truths of the Catholic Church.

The two men who were principally instrumental in bringing about the rupture with Rome, were the worst to whom the Reformation could possibly be entrusted. But under Henry, to whom lust and avarice were his chief incentives, the Reformation was political rather than religious. The Church had more to fear from Cranmer; a man who declared kings to be the spiritual, as well as the temporal rulers of the Church; who denied that any distinction existed between Bishops and Priests; a man without any fixed principle of belief, leaning at one time to the Romanists, at another to the Puritans, as best suited his own purposes. The first we hear of him was as a time-server, the aider and abettor of Henry's adultery; the last we know of him, was that he was a coward in meeting that death to which he had so mercilessly consigned others. But he too was, fortunately for the Church, stopped in his career by the death of Edward, and his deprivation under Mary.

The dissolution of the monasteries was the worst feature in the Reformation; it was an act of abominable and lawless rapacity. No doubt the monks had fallen from the activity and zeal in preaching which they had shown in the thirteenth century: and the monasteries needed Reformation. But to gratify the avarice of a rapacious tyrant, six hundred and forty-

five monasteries, and more than two-thousand chapels and hospitals were, according to Hume, destroyed, and their wealth confiscated, the annual income of which amounted to, an enormous sum at that time, £160,000. It is true William of Wykeham, Archbishop Chicheley, William of Waynfleet, and after them, Wolsey, had already appropriated the estates of Priories towards the endowmen tof their colleges; but it was for the promotion of learning. Henry, although he is said to have endowed six bishoprics from a small portion of the spoil, had no such excuse. His sole object was the gratification of his avarice, which nothing short of the most complete Vandalism could satiate. Everything that could bring money into his capacious maw was ruthlessly confiscated; churches, chapels, cloisters, even the bells and the very lead from the roofs, were dismantled or despoiled.

Whatever accusations may be alleged against the monasteries, it is certain that on their destruction, and the destruction of their libraries, followed also a decline in learning. But the greatest misfortune was the misery that their destruction caused to the poor. Numbers drew their daily subsistence from them. The Monks coming themselves from the poorer classes, and having no family cares or expenses, were the friends and benefactors of the poor. By the

destruction of the monasteries, the poor suffered beyond description. The great source of charity was cut off; and so great was the consequent amount of misery and crime, that during the reign of Henry VIII. the number of executions in England was computed at not less than seventy thousand.

But notwithstanding such drawbacks we must be content that we have retained the great doctrines of the Catholic Church. Thus Ken says: "Glory to Thee, O Lord God, who hast made me a member of the particular Church of England, whose faith, and government, and worship is one holy, and Catholic, and Apostolic. . . . and which I firmly believe to be a sound part of the Universal Church." And Archbishop Land says: "I was confident for the Faith professed by the Church. . . . And I had reason for my confidence. For to believe the Scripture and the Creeds, to believe those in the sense of the Primitive Church, to receive the four great General Councils, so much magnified by antiquity, to believe all points of doctrine generally received as fundamental in the Church of Christ, is a faith in which to live and die cannot but give Salvation."

Chapter IX.

THE REFORMATION DID NOT UNCATHOLICIZE THE CHURCH.

ROMANISTS not unfrequently assert, and with them some members of our own Church, through a mistaken notion of the objects and character of the Reformation, agree, that the Anglican Church, whatever she was before, became Protestant at the Reformation. Of course in answer to an objection so historically untrue, it would be impossible to reply that she is in all respects identically the same now as she was before the Reformation, for the simple reason that now she is reformed, whereas previously she was unreformed. Yet notwithstanding, it is worthy of notice that so little violence was done at the Reformation to existing rites or doctrines, that whatever objections were raised proceeded not from Romanists but Puritans; whilst of the former, numbers attended the services of the Reformed Church for this reason, that, whilst it had weeded out the corruptions of Rome, it had retained all its essential elements.

But evidently her Ecclesiastical Identity at the two periods is untouched. She retains at the present day all the primitive doctrines and the essential elements which she possessed at the commencement of the sixteenth century. She retains the Apostolical Succession derived through the same sources as before, and with it the three Orders of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons. She retains two Sacraments, Baptism and the Supper of the Lord, as generally, *i.e.* generically and therefore absolutely, necessary to salvation; whilst she does not reject the other five Sacraments, although she classes them differently from the two great Sacraments, which alone were ordained, with an outward visible sign and an inward spiritual grace, by Christ Himself. She teaches in her Ordinal that Ordination confers upon the Priesthood the power to absolve sins; she inculcates Confession, and prescribes a form of Absolution. In the Homilies the authority of the Fathers, of the General Councils, of the Primitive Church; the Sacramental nature of marriage; Baptismal Regeneration, and the Real Presence, are set forth. She holds the same Creeds; she still founds her faith on the Bible as interpreted by the Church; and rejects the Heresies which the Church has condemned.

With regard to our Orders, the Romanists

raise another objection, equally in opposition to facts and historical evidence, viz., that the Roman See has entire jurisdiction over all Bishops; and that no Bishops, Greek, Latin, or Anglican, have any mission themselves or right to ordain others, except such as they receive from Rome. But if we allow for a moment that Bishops do derive their Mission from Rome, this alone would not invalidate our Orders; the validity of Orders could not depend, even if the Mission does, upon any connection or confirmation from Rome, but is derived through succession from the Apostles; and it must be observed, that this difference between the Succession and the Mission Romanists themselves allow.

But, in fact, the Roman no more than the Anglican is *the* Catholic Church, but both are particular branches of it; our separation from Rome, which was not voluntary on our part, but which was rendered necessary by Rome's errors, was no more a separation from *the* Catholic Church, than was the separation of the Eastern and Western Churches in the ninth century; the jurisdiction of our Bishops is derived from the Apostles; submission to the Pope is not of the essence of a Church, a delusion of which Barrow asserts Gregory II. to have been the father; nor does the fact that Rome usurped and exercised an uncanonical

jurisdiction over the Episcopate of this country affect the question.

It is almost ludicrous to observe the shifts to which Romanists resort in their zeal for disparaging English Orders. Some few of them cling, or profess to cling, to the threadbare objection as to the Consecration of Barlow and Parker. The more honest, and not the least learned of them, freely confess that Anglican Orders are quite as certain as those of the Greek or Latin Churches; they ridicule the Nag's Head fable as absurd and unfounded, simply because, if any doubt existed as to Barlow's Consecration (for which there existed no foundation except his own Erastianism, especially as he had held three Bishoprics in succession), yet there cannot be the least doubt as to the validity of the Orders of the three other Bishops, who assisted at Parker's Consecration. Therefore that our Bishops have been ordained in a direct and unbroken line from the Apostles, few Romanists of learning or repute at the present day deny; indeed there is no room for doubt, for any one that takes the trouble can read for himself the various records that exist, carrying up our succession through Theodore, and S. Augustine to SS. Peter and Paul.

Driven from this ground, Romanists (and amongst these we grieve to number so great and respected a name as that of Dr. Newman)

betake themselves to arguments founded, not even on probability, and only the barest possibility; a possibility which as, from its very nature, it does not admit of proof on one side, so neither is it capable of being disproved on the other; and which might be with equal reason alleged against themselves, or even against the undivided Church itself, in the purest and most primitive ages. Thus a doubt is cast upon our Orders, because the Apostolical succession, which they allow to be found in the Anglican Church, is not one of Anglican Belief. From its very recklessness, this statement scarcely needs refutation. For from the time of the Caroline Divines, through the high and dry Protestantism of the Hanoverian Establishment if there was one prevailing doctrine, it was that of the Apostolical succession; and if in the present day some ultra-Protestants and Rationalists (and are not such objectors to all dogma to be found in the Roman Communion?) disbelieve the doctrine, how can that affect the doctrine itself, which has never been denied by any Synod or combined action of the Anglican Church?

Again, the prevalent disbelief of the Real Presence amongst Protestants, is not unfrequently adduced as an argument against our possessing the Apostolical succession. The connection is somewhat difficult to compre-

hend; but the argument (how illogical, we need not observe) is this:—

"If there is a true succession there is a true Eucharist;" but

"There is not a true Eucharist (because some Anglicans do not believe in the Real Presence:")

Therefore "There is not a true succession."

Perhaps we may be allowed to carry out such an excellent piece of Romanist logic to another conclusion, and to infer that those Protestants who do not believe in the Real Presence have not; whilst those in the English Church who do believe in the Real Presence have, the Apostolical Succession. Whatever may be the force of the argument, is it not equally damaging to Romanists themselves; for surely it would not be difficult to turn the tables on them on the score of the immorality, and therefore practical infidelity, which disgraced the Roman Hierachy in the middle ages?

A third argument against our succession is based on the uncertainty of, and the careless manner in which, Holy Baptism is sometimes celebrated, and hence the danger that consecrating bishops may themselves not have been rightly baptized, and therefore not be Christians. This objection is met by the fact that the validity of Baptism is quite as rigorously provided for by the Anglican as by the Romish

Church; and although it is equally possible in both Churches, it is most improbable, that all the consecrating bishops should be unbaptized.

But not only do Romanists profess to ignore our Catholicism by denying the validity of our Orders, and the unity of our Church with the Church before the Reformation; but with regard to the Reformation itself, they assert that it was only Parliamentary, and never received the sanction of the Anglican Church. Now whatever may be our views of the Reformation, or of the object that Henry VIII. had in throwing off the Pope's supremacy, there cannot be a moment's doubt about one thing:—that from the very commencement, in the matter of the payment of Annates to Rome, it was Convocation *first*, and *not till afterwards*, Parliament, that constantly petitioned Henry to take steps in the work of Reform. And so also in all the stages which were necessary, as preliminaries to the declaration of Independence, the sanction both of Parliament and of Convocation was received; and thus not only is the statement of the Romanist not true, but quite contrary to the truth, which is, that the Reformation was brought about by the full and unanimous consent of Church and State.

It is necessary to bear this in mind in the present day. For if the agreement of Convocation and Parliament was necessary for the estab-

lishment of the Reformation, so, as Convocation remains still an integral part of the Constitution, the same agreement is necessary before any alteration is made in the Rubrics, or Formularies, or Ritual of the Church: or any change in the Prayer Book, which from the year 1661 to the present day has remained the same.

Let us see how far it is true that the Prayer Book was the work of Parliament and not the Church.

Firstly: In the reign of Henry VIII. the King's Primer, containing the Litany and several Prayers and Collects, was published in the vernacular language and was approved by *Convocation.*

Secondly: In the reign of Edward VI. Communion in both kinds was established, and *approved by Convocation.* Two Common Prayer Books were drawn up at different times in his reign; the first of which contained Services for Sundays and holidays, Liturgy, and the occasional Offices, Baptism, Confirmation, Matrimony and Burial; and this book was *approved by Convocation* and Parliament.

But thirdly: Foreign interference was soon brought to bear on the Church. Calvin disliking the Catholic spirit in which the English Reformation was being carried on, and the willing consent it met with from the people,

prevailed upon Cranmer to remodel the Prayer Book after the fashion prevailing at Geneva. This was exactly the contrary principle to that which had been before adopted. Accordingly Cranmer called to his aid Bucer and Peter Martyr, not only foreigners, but men who were ignorant of the English language. In this second Prayer Book of Edward VI., which was drawn up in 1552, certain additions were made to the first Book, viz., the Sentences, Exhortation, Confession, and Absolution; the first Prayer Book having begun with the Lord's Prayer. So far not much harm was done. But various changes from the first Book, in the shape of omissions, were made, viz., the Oil in Baptism; Unction of the Sick; Prayers for the Dead; the Invocation of the Holy Ghost at the Consecration of the Eucharist; the Prayer of Oblation; also the prayer which ordered Water to be mixed with Wine at the Holy Communion. The Vestments, also, enjoined in the first Book, were ordered to be laid aside; and a Rubric was inserted to explain kneeling at Holy Communion. It must be remarked that this Book does not appear to have received the sanction of Convocation; whilst Parliament declared that the alterations proceeded from curiosity, rather than from any worthy cause.

Fourthly: Both acts of the reign of King Edward having been repealed by Queen Mary,

the Second Book of Edward VI. was, on the accession of Queen Elizabeth, adopted, but with some important changes. The words "from the tyranny of the Bishop of Rome, and all his detestable enormities," were omitted in the Litany; whilst a very important addition to the Liturgy was made from the First Book of King Edward VI. of the words: "The Body—Blood—of our Lord Jesus Christ, which was given—shed—for thee, preserve thy body and soul unto everlasting life." Two Prayers, one for the Queen the other for the Clergy, were added at the end of the Litany; whilst some Rubrics were altered; the words "the accustomed place or chancel" being substituted for "in such place as the people may best hear;" the Rubric at the end of the Communion Service against our Lord's Real and Essential Presence in the Sacrament was left out; and the Vestments' Rubric restored.

These were the last changes, except a few of no doctrinal importance made in the reign of James I., and also at the Savoy Conference, at which directions were given to the Commissioners "to compare the Common Prayer Book with the most ancient Liturgies in the most Primitive times." And thus the whole Prayer Book, as we have it now was drawn up, and approved both by *Convocation* and Parliament in 1661.

The Canons of 1604 were *drawn up by Convocation,* assembled under the Bishop of London.

The Thirty-nine Articles were *agreed upon by Convocation* under Archbishop Parker.

It is doubtful whether the Homilies received the sanction of Convocation; but it is a matter of no consequence, as they are stated in the Thirty-fifth Article, which was sanctioned by Convocation, "to contain a godly and wholesome doctrine."

So much for the objection of the Romanists that the Reformation was Parliamentary, and never received the sanction of the Church.

Nor did these alterations involve any revolutionary change. Thus the 30th Canon of 1604 says: "So far was it from the mind of the Church of England to forsake and reject the Churches of Italy, France, Spain, Germany, or any such like Churches, in all things which they held and practised, that, as the Apology of the Church of England confesseth, it doth with reverence retain those ceremonies which do neither endanger the Church of God nor offend the minds of sober men; and only departed from them on those particular points wherein they have fallen both from themselves and in their ancient integrity, and from the

Apostolic Churches which were then first founded."

If, therefore, it be asked what ceremonies are at present allowable, it must be answered, that all ceremonies are retained according to the above Canon, which are of primitive usage in the other Catholic Churches of Christendom; if it be asked, again, what ceremonies the Church rejects, the same Canon answers, that she rejects only those wherein other Churches have fallen from themselves, or from the Apostolic Churches. In other words, the test of the lawfulness of Ritual is its Catholicity; and it is therefore reasonable to conclude that all ceremonies of the Primitive Church, unless expressly prohibited, are allowable.

We need only mention a few. Two Lights on the Altar were sanctioned by S. Jerome, who lived in the fifth century; were used under the Mass, with which our Liturgy is identical; were ordered by the Injunctions of Edward VI., and have always been retained in Cathedrals and Collegiate Churches. And these Two Lights should be lighted; as S. Jerome says: "Lights are kindled, though the sun may be shining, not to put darkness to flight, but to show a sign of rejoicing." The same antiquity may be claimed for the lawfulness of Incense, which with the Lights are mentioned in the earliest Liturgies.

As to the mixed Chalice; judging from the custom amongst the Jews, there is reason for believing that the Wine which our Saviour blessed was mixed with water; it is mentioned by some of the earliest Fathers; it has been the immemorial custom of the Church, and universally adopted except by the Monophysites of Armenia.

Nor is there any valid reason against the Reserved Sacrament. It was allowed under Edward VI.'s first Prayer Book. There is, indeed, a Rubric prescribing the mode of consuming what is left of the Holy Sacrament; but this, we may suppose, is to provide for its decent disposal. The most profitable and decent disposal is its careful reservation for use in celebrations for the sick.

The ornaments of the Church and of the Ministers are expressly enjoined in the Rubric immediately preceding the Order for Morning Prayer. "Here it is to be noted that such ornaments of the Church and of the Ministers thereof, at all times of their ministrations, shall be retained and be in use as were in the Church of England by authority in the second year of King Edward VI." Now Edward VI. came to the throne in January, 1547. In the second year of his reign his first Prayer Book was drawn up, and received the sanction of Convocation. It is clear, therefore, that this is the

book referred to; it remains to be seen what are the ornaments allowable under that Prayer Book.

They were as follows:—

The Cope, or Vestment, *i.e.*, Chasuble. Of these two, the vestment, called in Greek, "φαινόλιον," and in Latin "casula," is appointed to be worn by Bishops in all public ministrations (or, instead, they may wear the "cappa," or cope); and to be worn (or, instead of this, a cope,) by Priests, only at the celebration of Holy Communion. The cope, beyond the above uses, is the proper dress for clergy in processions and solemn occasions with a hood attached to it. By the 24th Canon the cope alone is prescribed, and that only in Cathedral Churches; but the Prayer Book having been revised and sanctioned in 1661, clearly overrides the Canon of 1604.

The Tunicle, without sleeves in the Eastern, and with sleeves in the Western Church, in which case it is called the Dalmatic, is to be worn by assistants—Priests, Deacons, or subdeacons—in Holy Communion.

The Albe is prescribed to be worn by Bishops at all their ministrations, and by Priests and Deacons at Holy Communion. It differs from the surplice in being confined by a girdle in the middle, and closed at the wrists.

The Rochette, a linen garment with narrower

sleeves than the surplice, worn by Bishops. Over it formerly was worn a scarlet Chimere, which in the time of Elizabeth was exchanged for the black satin Chimere now worn.

The Pastoral Staff is spoken of at the Council of Toledo as being used by Bishops; it terminates in a crook, and is the staff of Bishops; as distinguished from a Crosier, which is the staff of Archbishops, and terminates in a cross.

The Surplice is prescribed to be worn by Ministers at Matins and Evensong, at baptisms and burials, and by Bishops at the Celebrations of Holy Communion.

The Hood, to be worn in cathedral churches and colleges. This was generally fastened to the Cope, and drawn over the head, as a protection against the weather. It was used both by clergy and laity, as well as the Monastic Orders.

The Rubric thus determines what are the lawful vestments for the different orders of clergy. It is so plain that it might have been supposed no one, not even the Privy Council, could have distorted its meaning, or disputed its authority. A clergyman, at his ordination, is expected to know and understand the meaning and history of the Rubrics; he finds at the very commencement of the Prayer Book a Rubric which prescribes certain vestments for the clergy, and in that Rubric he is referred to

another Prayer Book for more precise information. It is his duty, also, to be acquainted with the Articles, Homilies, and Canons, and he finds in these nothing that weakens the Rubric as to vestments.

Can it be reasonably expected of every clergyman that he should also be an acute lawyer? in fact, more acute than many lawyers—more acute than the Privy Council itself in the judgment of Westerton *v.* Liddell? Is it expected of him to wade through abstruse advertisements, and to search there for the meaning of a plainly-worded Rubric? or, if he did, and he found an advertisement of Queen Elizabeth contravening a Rubric, would he be so wrong-headed as to suppose an advertisement could override the Prayer Book, which he has sworn to obey? Could any unbiassed person—for the Judicial Committee notoriously was not unbiassed—imagine for a moment that an advertisement was on a par with a Rubric? or that it was to be accepted, and the latter rejected?

The history of these advertisements is this. During the reign of Mary, and the re-establishment of Romanism, the great confusion as to the accessories of Divine Worship, caused by the forms and ceremonies introduced into the Church, and the dislike and discontent which they produced, necessitated a complete revi-

sion; and accordingly, amongst other things, the ornaments of the Church were brought under review. The Bishops, acting under Queen Elizabeth's authority, drew up certain advertisements, which could not in any case, as they only set forth the *minimum* of what was required for Divine Service, invalidate the Rubric of 1559. But there is reason to believe they never received the Queen's approval; certainly they never received that of Convocation.

And even if they had gone forth with full authority at the time, is it not reasonable to conclude that any future enactment, of equal authority, would supersede an advertisement of an earlier date, and therefore that the Prayer Book of 1603 and that of 1662, which received the sanction both of Convocation and of Parliament, annulled an advertisement of 1564? No one who takes the trouble to compare the Prayer Book of Elizabeth with those of Edward, can fail to infer that it was no fortuitous circumstance by which a Rubric, which involved so high and important a doctrine, recurred to the first instead of the second Prayer Book of Edward VI., especially as two other most important changes were made, viz., the omission of the Rubric at the end of the Communion Office in the second Book, as to our Lord's Real and Essential Presence; and

the re-introduction from the first Book of the words—"The Body—Blood—of our Lord Jesus Christ, which was given—shed—for thee, preserve thy body and soul unto everlasting life."

But if these Advertisements are to be made law and supersede the Rubric, what are we to say of the Injunctions of Queen Elizabeth? If one is necessary, why not the other? The Injunctions prescribe that the Litany is to be sung or said in the midst of the church, meaning, no doubt, from a fald-stool. Is this Injunction always obeyed? Again, they give instructions for services on Sundays and Holy-days, and for the Litany on Wednesdays and Fridays; are therefore daily Matins and Even-song to be discontinued? The Table-Prayers (as they have been called) are to be said from the pulpit instead of the altar (which would certainly be an improvement), is this obeyed? The Judicial Committee of the Privy Council is no doubt a respectable tribunal in civil causes; but even if to it belonged lawful authority to decide ecclesiastical cases, this decision, from its wilfulness and absurdity, must be laid aside. The most the Advertisements could do is, not to render illegal the vestments in those that use them, but to render their disuse permissible in those who do not use them.

Chapter X.

CHURCH DISCIPLINE AND THE PRIVY COUNCIL.

THE right of the Church to administer her own discipline—to govern, to make and define laws and ceremonies, to admonish and excommunicate, to bind and loose—is derived from the power of the Keys given to S. Peter, and through him to the other Apostles and their successors to the end of the world.

If it be asked what authority the Anglican Church possesses for the maintenance of its Rubrics, Ordinances, and Discipline, the answer is given in the Twentieth Article, which says that "the Church hath power to decree Rites and Ceremonies, and authority in Controversies of Faith." And this is agreeable to our Lord's teaching: "if he shall neglect to hear them, tell it unto the Church; but if he neglect to hear the Church, let him be unto thee as a heathen or a publican." With this agrees the language of the Reformers. Cranmer says: "I may err, but heretic I

cannot be; forasmuch as I am ready in all things to follow the judgment of the most sacred Word of God, and of the Holy Catholic Church." And Calvin stamps with his approval the Councils of Nice, Constantinople, and Ephesus.

From the earliest times the authority of the Church in ecclesiastical matters was recognised by the State. Under the Saxon Heptarchy the King and Bishop sat together in the same Court, at one time in Synod summoned by the Peer, at another in Synod summoned by the Bishop; and heard together temporal and spiritual causes. In the time of William the Conqueror the two Courts were separated. Under Edward I. the three Estates of the Realm were convened, and sat for the first time in their respective houses; the Lords (and with them the Bishops, as Peers,) and the Commons in the two Houses of Parliament, and the Bishops and Clergy in Convocation. Under Henry VIII. the latter were neither allowed to assemble, nor to pass Laws or Canons for the Church, without the permission of the Crown.

But, besides Convocation, there were Provincial and Diocesan Synods; the former presided over by the Archbishop, and attended by the Suffragan Bishops, for the purpose of regulating the affairs of the Province, the latter

for Diocesan purposes, presided over by the Bishop, and attended by the Clergy of the diocese.

Such was the machinery provided for carrying out the discipline of the Church; and it would be difficult to devise a system which, if properly organised, and freed from external interference, could more effectually represent the interests of the Church, and conduce so materially to the welfare of the State.

A Precedent for the re-establishment of Diocesan Synods was set in 1851, by the late Bishop of Exeter after the Gorham Controversy, and was marked with great success. Convocation also, although, as at present constituted, an inadequate representative of the Church, seems to be putting forth new life.

But if it be asked how the Church in the nineteenth century exercises her discipline, it must be confessed that partly through the Church's own neglect, and partly through State opposition, discipline has been suppressed; that until Provincial and Diocesan Synods, and Convocation in its integrity, shall be revived, the Church's authority not only in controversies of faith, but also in rites and ceremonies, is altogether in abeyance, and still worse, is in danger of being usurped by Parliament. At any rate, as long as there is a lay council at the head, claiming power to

override the decision of the Church's Courts, so long it is plain the Church has been robbed of the authority which belongs to her, and has no power to enforce her decisions.

Romanists, always willing to seize upon our weak points and ready to take advantage of our difficulties, accuse us of being a Church under the spiritual authority of a temporal head; with no power to make laws for its own government, or for the maintenance of discipline; but constantly groaning under the burden of the civil magistrate in Ecclesiastical matters. We cannot altogether deny this, although matters are not so bad as Rome represents them. Notwithstanding all our drawbacks, our own Church is in a far more independent position than the Roman Church, as it exists in the present day in Austria, Germany, Spain, and Italy. This is so forcibly and truly expressed by Mr. Palmer, that it will be as well, although at some length, to quote his words, in answer to the objection raised by Romanists. "I ask," says he, "whether the Parliaments of France did not, for a long series of years exercise jurisdiction over the administration of the Sacraments, compelling the Roman Bishops and Priests of France to give the Sacrament to Jansenists whom they believed to be Heretics? Did they not repeatedly judge in questions of faith, viz., as to the obligation of the Bull 'Unigenitus?' Did

they not take cognizance of questions of faith and discipline to such a degree, that they were said to resemble a school of theology? I ask whether the clergy of France were not wholly under the control of the King, who could prescribe their subjects of debate, prevent them from debating, prorogue, dissolve, etc.?

"Did they not repeatedly beg in vain from the Kings of France, for a long series of years, to be permitted to hold Provincial Synods for the suppression of immorality, heresy, and infidelity? Is not this liberty still withheld from them, and from every other Roman Church in Europe? I further ask whether the Emperor Joseph II. did not enslave the Churches of Germany and Italy? Whether he did not suppress monasteries, suppress and unite bishoprics? Whether he did not suspend the Bishops from conferring Orders, exact from them oaths of obedience to all his measures present and future, issue royal decrees for removing images from churches, and for regulation of divine worship to the minutest point, even to the number of candles at Mass? Whether he did not take on himself to silence preachers who had declaimed against persons of unsound faith? Whether he did not issue decrees against the Bull 'Unigenitus,' thus interfering with the doctrinal decision of the Roman Church? I ask whether this conduct was not

accurately imitated by the Grand Duke of Tuscany, the King of Naples, the Duke of Parma; whether it did not become prevalent in almost every part of the Roman Church; and whether its effects do not continue to the present day? I ask again, whether 'Organic Articles' were not enacted by Buonaparte in the new Gallican Church, which placed everything in ecclesiastical affairs under the Government? Whether the Bishops were not forbidden by the Emperor to confer Orders without the permission of Government; whether the obvious intention was not to place the Priests, even in their spiritual functions, under the civil powers? And in fine whether the obnoxious 'Organic Articles' are not in the present day, in almost every point, in force? I again ask, whether the Order of Jesuits was not suppressed by the mere civil powers in Portugal, Spain, France, Italy, etc.; whether convents, monasteries, confraternities, friars, and monks, and nuns, of every sort and kind, were not extinguished, suppressed, annihilated by royal commission, and by the temporal power in France, Germany, Austria, Italy, Sicily, Spain, Portugal, etc., and in oposition to the petitions and protests of the Pope and Bishops? I again ask, whether the King of Sicily does, in his 'Tribunal of the Monarchy,' up to the present day, try ecclesiastical causes, censure, excommuni-

cate, absolve? Whether this tribunal did not, in 1712, give absolution from episcopal excommunication; and whether it was not restored by Benedict XII. in 1728?

"In fine, was not Gregory XVI. himself compelled, in his Encyclical letter of 1832, to utter the most vehement complaints and lamentations at the degraded condition of the Roman obedience? Does he not confess that the Church is subjected to *earthly considerations, reduced to a base servitude*, the rights of its Bishops trampled on."

Romanists perhaps would answer that the above description, although true, is contrary to the principles universally advocated by their Church; but should they accuse us of a subserviency, equally against our principles, to the civil magistrates? or can they deny, however deep it has fallen, that our discipline is above the level of that of the Romish Church?

Low as has been the condition of Church discipline in our Church for the last century, it is only within the last forty years that she has been deprived of the last vestige of authority. Till then, the Court of Delegates, which was of an ecclesiastical character, was the supreme court in ecclesiastical matters. That Court had existed ever since the sixteenth century, and to it all causes connected with the Church, with the exception of such as imme-

diately affected the sovereign, were submitted. The Court, according to Bishop Gibson, who is the great authority on the subject, was composed partly of Bishops, partly of ecclesiastical persons selected for the purpose; and therefore it was a Court, not of course as desirable as Convocation or Ecclesiastical Synods, yet the next best arrangement that could have been made; at any rate perfectly dissimilar to the present Court of Final Appeal. In 1832, soon after passing the Reform Bill, a Government, of revolutionary tendencies in Church matters, bent on favouring the Dissenters, no matter with what amount of injustice to the Church, set itself to Church reform; their notion of reform being to damage it as much as possible, or, which amounted at that time to the same thing, as much as Parliament would permit. One of the first acts in this direction, was, as we have already seen, the suppression of ten Irish Bishoprics, against the will of the Church, and without the sanction of Convocation. In 1832 the Court of Delegates was done away with, and its jurisdiction transferred to the *whole* Privy Council, of which the two Archbishops and the Bishop of London are *ex officio* members. This arrangement was altered the following year, and the appeal transferred to the *Judicial Committee* of the Privy Council, of which no Bishop or Archbishop are *ex officio*

members. It is true that those Bishops, who are members of the Privy Council, may be called in to hear the case, but it does not appear that even then they sit as Judges.

The institution of such an absurdity as the Judicial Committee of Privy Council, a purely lay Court, in ecclesiastical matters, is indeed such as to render England a ridicule and contempt in the eyes of Europe; indeed, Lord Brougham himself, who was instrumental in establishing this Court of Final Appeal, confessed that it was not intended to try such causes as have of late years been brought before it.

Let us understand what such a Court means, or at any rate might mean. Probably the Lord Chancellor sits as President. He is himself an amiable and religious man, of the old orthodox high and dry school; his mind has been perfectly made up some time since as to the illegality of Ritualism; "laudator temporis acti;" he has lived a long life of seventy years, and during all that time such practices were never heard of till the last few years; and therefore must be unlawful. And so, with the case already prejudged, he takes his seat as President, with the best intentions and the greatest integrity of purpose; but still, he is notoriously biassed, and therefore, according to every principle of law, an unfair Judge. What

wonder then if he packs, as other members of the Court, men of like mind with himself, and so the case is brought into Court, argued at an immense expense of money and time on both sides; and, after a delay of many months, a decision is given, which was practically arrived at before the trial commenced.

And yet this is comparatively a favourable view of the case. We will take another possible, and some day, if things continue to progress at their present railway-speed, not altogether an improbable case. A Nonconformist Lord Chancellor is President. The members are (1) a Jew: (2) a Turk: (3) an Infidel: (4) a Heretic. Some purely civil case has just been disposed of; the same members with an Archbishop and Bishop or so thrown in, for appearance' sake, not as Judges, but Assessors, remain to try the next case. What is it? a question as to the Real Presence. The four members sit aghast: what can it mean? Their knowledge of Church matters has up to this time been confined to the external architecture of the Churches. But their uncertainty is only momentary. The President reminds them that they are in England, and that England is a free country; that in any other case their doubts might be reasonable; but in matters of religion there is a difference; of such they are competent judges; for the Establishment sub-

ordinates the Church to the State. He explains, *en passant*, that the Church is called Established on the "lucus a non lucendo" principle, because it upsets the Established usage and the Established meaning of words; hence when a Rubric in the Prayer Book orders morning and evening prayer daily throughout the year, it means only on Sunday; or prescribes certain vestments to be worn, it means they are not to be worn; or orders the Priest to stand at a certain part of the service before the altar, it might perhaps mean at the back, or the side, but it cannot possible mean literally before it.

And he confirms his own opinion by reference to previous decisions of the Privy Council. He shows them how, when the Church declares a child to be regenerate in Holy Baptism, the Privy Council ruled that a child either is, or is not, regenerate, as the case might be; and how by another judgment, it pronounced that the word "eternal" does not mean "lasting for ever." Similarly, they must not be surprised, if bringing these judgments to bear upon the present case, they should find that the Real Presence means the reverse. Perhaps he playfully reminds them of the saying of Dr. Johnson, "plus negabit unâ horâ unus asciras, quem centum doctores in centum annis probaverint."

Now, is it fair that ecclesiastical knowledge and moral character should form no element in the selection of a Judge, and the members of the Court, in matters affecting the Church? With the greatest respect for the character, and learning, and fairness of our Judges, it may be asked, What, as a rule, are Lord Chancellors supposed to know of Church History and Church Law? Can a Lord Chancellor who is, perhaps, ignorant of the most elementary doctrines, or who could speak of the two inferior Persons of the Trinity, be a fit and proper person to exercise an office in spiritual matters?

But it is said that with the Bishops should rest the authority in doubtful and disputed matters of doctrine and discipline; and in support of this, reference is made to the Preface of the Prayer Book "concerning the service of the Church." The words in the Preface are as follows: "To appease all such diversity (if any arise), and for the resolution of all doubts . . . the parties that so doubt, or diversely take anything, shall alway resort to the Bishop of the Diocese, who by his direction shall take order for the quieting and appeasing of the same; so that the same order be not contrary to anything contained in this Book. And if the Bishop of the Diocese be in doubt, then he may send for the resolution thereof to the Archbishop."

Desirable as such a course for solving difficulties might be; and reasonable as it was at the time the Preface was framed; the Injunction is rendered impracticable by the present condition of the Church. Some few years ago, twenty-four Bishops signed an address to the clergy, suggestive of a plan which they hoped might be a remedy for religious doubts, from which we extract the following words: "There are many cases where the law may be variously interpreted, and we believe we are but carrying out the Church's principles, when we urge you to have recourse in all such cases to the advice of her Chief Pastors." Such counsel was fatherly and reasonable in itself; what was the result? Several Bishops were applied to as to the best mode of carrying out the Rubric; they recommended that when Rubric and custom conflicted, custom should be followed, and the Rubric violated. Again, when applied to as to the use of the Church Militant Prayer, they urged the inexpediency of the frequent change of dress which its use necessitated, as a reason for omitting it altogether; when the recommendation of one uniform dress through the whole service would have removed the difficulty, and have strengthened the hands of the clergy by the episcopal sanction.

But, however desirous the clergy may be to yield obedience to the godly admonitions of

their Bishops, a difficulty at once arises. Are the Bishops all of one mind? Is there any one general standard of doctrine amongst them. Or, is there one thing for which, as a body, they are uniformly distinguished? If so, the episcopal uniformity might, with some show of reason, be claimed in the matter of rites and ceremonies. As things are at present, may not a Bishop's doctrine be on a level with the lowest Calvinism? Is there not as wide a discrepancy between the Bishops as amongst Priests? Is a Priest, on preferment from one Diocese to another, to change his doctrine, and adapt it to that of the Bishop? and, on a third preferment, to change again, in order to conform with another Bishop? "Cœlum et animos mutare?"

Or, is this a matter which could profitably be submitted to the Archbishop's decision?

Can it be said, there is any one principle on which Bishops are elected? Is it for their piety? or their learning? or their parochial experience? or their doctrine? or because they have been good schoolmasters? or because they are the sons or nephews of peers? or because they have been useful to the Prime Minister at elections, and are likely to be of political service in Parliament? Let the Clergy be told that there is one principle of selection; and then, in addition to the respect they feel for

their office, they will look to them as an authority on that, although not necessarily yield them blind obedience on all subjects.

If on the other hand a man who at college was notorious only as a dunce; or who cannot construe his Greek Testament; or cannot speak in public without showing his ignorance on Ecclesiastical subjects;—(the cases are only imaginary)—if men like these are made Bishops, are the Clergy to look to them as authorities in the interpretation of the Church's formularies, or in matter of doctrine? It was once the fashion to appoint Heads of Colleges as Bishops; and from their acquaintance with men, something although not much might be said in its favour; but that fashion died out to be succeeded by another still worse, but a very favourite one in the present day, the appointment of a schoolmaster. Now we have no hesitation in saying that, *as a body*, head-masters of schools, from their ignorance of the world, their narrow-mindedness, their very limited general learning, are most unsuited for the Episcopate. On the subject of the Greek Particles or the Digamma, doubtless they are irreproachable. But set them at parish work; hear them preach an extempore sermon to farmers or labouring men; what training, or special fitness, do they possess which pre-eminently marks them out for such work? And

if they are made Bishops, what wonder if they are ignorant of theology, for what opportunity have they had of studying it? or even if they have been skilled in the management of the sons of the aristocracy, what aptitude have they displayed for the management of the multiform machinery of a parish?

The Bishops in the present day, with few exceptions, have given no indication of being theologians. "For more than half a century," says Mr. Buckle, we know not with what truth, "the Episcopal Bench, with one brilliant living exception, has not been occupied by any man of genius; scarcely by any whose learning has gained him a European reputation." So that Bishops cannot expect that their authority should be accepted as final where ecclesiastical research and erudition are required, unless they are theologians themselves. Priests and Deacons alike are bound to submit with a glad mind and will to their judgment and admonition; but only so far as they are "godly." And this means so far as they are in accordance with the will of God, as declared in the Bible, and interpreted by the Church. The position of the Clergy is clear, and has of late years been plainly defined by the Pan-Anglican Synod; "to maintain the faith in its antiquity, as taught in the Bible, and held by the Primitive Church, as summed up in the Creed, and

affirmed by the General Council." Truth is one, and never can be changed. "Laws touching matters of order," says Hooker, "are changeable by the power of the Church, articles of doctrine not so." This is the Church's charter, "stare super antiquas vias." And so, however great may be the respect we feel for our Fathers in God; we must fall back upon the Church; we must disobey even their judgments and admonitions, if unhappily they are opposed to the Primitive Church; much more must we disobey the decisions of any temporal Court, if they be at variance with the Faith "once for all delivered to the saints."

Chapter XI.

WHAT WILL BE THE FUTURE RELIGION OF ENGLAND?

"MANKIND are beginning scoffingly or seriously to ask, not how soon Christianity promises to overspread the would; but how soon the world will succeed in overpowering and superseding Christianity." (Bampton Lectures, 1871.)

Such is the critical state to which the neo-Christianity of the day has brought the Church. "When the Son of Man cometh, shall he find faith upon the earth?" is a question which, notwithstanding our belief that the gates of hell shall never prevail against the Church, the retrogressive religion of the nineteenth century almost warrants our asking. We cannot shut our eyes to the impending danger, nor to the fact that there is a school growing up in our very midst, numbering amongst its adherents some, even high, dignitaries of the Church, Heads of Colleges, and parish Priests; a school which accepts or rejects a certain por-

tion of the Bible, according to its individual judgment; which advocates Reason as the sole basis of theology, and so drifts away not unfrequently into open Infidelity.

For by what milder or expressive term can we designate such a free-handling of the Bible as can derive from it, or rather in opposition to it, such conclusions as the following: The Bible is not inspired, and therefore not an infallible guide. It must be accepted or rejected as any other book — All miracles must be rejected, and with them prophecies also, as contrary to reason—The Bible account of Creation cannot be reconciled with science, and therefore must be rejected—It is intellectually absurd to believe that God should condemn the world for such an offence as that of our first parents —No such universal deluge as that in the time of Noah ever occurred—So far for the Old Testament; it is still worse with regard to the New. Thus we read that it is contrary to reason to believe that God descended from Heaven in the Person of a certain Man for a certain number of years, and then returned to Heaven again—The Synoptical Gospels from the similarity of the events which they relate, must have been copies—The demoniacal possession spoken of in the Gospels were ordinary attacks of epilepsy — S. Paul was a fiery fanatic, and was struck to the ground by the

stroke of a Syrian sun; and had a physician been consulted as to the vision he saw, he would have pronounced him to be labouring under the effect of a diseased brain. And the practical conclusion of the whole matter is that prayer is worse than idle, because God knows what we want, and has already resolved either to grant or to refuse what we would pray for.

Nor must it be supposed, that Rationalistic principles are not widely prevalent, because such sentiments as we have described are not openly and publicly avowed. If they were, this school of Free-thinkers would be less dangerous, for people would be at once sensible of their danger; parents especially would be careful lest their children should be brought in contact with such pernicious error. Instead of this, Infidelity works its way secretly; it is always progressive, it reaches its climax by degrees. Let us trace its progress. It begins with the Church; it substitutes reason for dogma as its basis; establishes the Bible, and the Bible only, as interpreted by reason and private judgment, as its axiom. Allying itself at first with Protestantism, it attacks the Athanasian Creed; certain clauses which charitably remind people of their danger, it misnames "damnatory;" it does not explain that those clauses reflect faithfully the words of our Saviour; on the contrary, it represents them

as unscriptural and uncharitable. By such reasoning it removes the Athanasian Creed out of the way; it then proceeds to the elimination of the other two; and thus by degrees to a general denial of the Church's teaching and formularies.

Thus far it has advanced by the aid of Protestantism; now it shakes off the alliance. From the Church it advances to the attack of the Bible. First it throws doubt upon the historical accuracy of the Bible; next it turns its attention to Miracles, first questioning their reasonableness, then their probability, and at last their possibility. Religion is next represented as a matter of æsthetic conviction. Morality, as the foundation of ethical and social life is indicated; and in this system the Saviour is represented, not indeed as divine, but as the model and most perfect specimen of possible or ideal humanity. Thus the redemption of the world is denied; sometimes even ridiculed as an exploded superstition. The idea of personal responsibility is held to be absurd; consequently prayer is useless, because there is a fixed law of nature, a kind of self-supporting machinery, which cannot be broken or turned aside. Thence the transition to Atheism or Pantheism; the denial of the existence of one creating and superintending God; of heaven and hell, and a future state; is easy and con-

sequential. A thorough indifference and a desire to ridicule all religion is the result; the Bible is never mentioned except in mockery; the Infidel proclaims his indifference as to whether the Bible is "the work of Jupiter or Jehovah, or Moses, or Jesus." He has long got beyond such controversy.

It may be objected that this is an unusual and an excessive phase, which the most fully developed Infidelity scarcely ever assumes in England, and is only to be met with on the Continent. That it is an excessive phase we gladly admit; but, unhappily, it is not so uncommon as is imagined. It is painful to contemplate, or even to imagine, the presence of such a contagious and ever-spreading poison lurking even within the confines of the Church; but it is wiser and better to know the worst and face our danger; not to do so, is but to imitate the ostrich, which buries its head in the sand in order to escape its pursuers. There is no disputing the fact, that open Infidelity, especially amongst the more scientific classes of English society, has now become so recognised as to be no unfrequent topic of conversation. Doubts are freely expressed, not merely as to arithmetical figures and miracles of the Old Testament, but as to the very existence of God. At the same time, Infidel books and magazines are widely circulated through our

lending libraries; they may be found, no longer now in obscure hovels, but in the drawing-rooms of the Aristocracy, to an extent which in the last generation would have been impossible, or would have called forth the intervention of the law.

This, then, is the present position, and this the danger to which the Church, and especially her younger members, are exposed. Protestantism during a long and undisputed reign advocated the right of private judgment; Rationalism followed on its wake, claimed also the right of private judgment, drew upon the Neology of Germany, and so fanned up and brought again into life the smouldering embers of an antiquated Infidelity.

The question, therefore, not unreasonably may be asked, What will be the future religion of England? Protestantism in Germany has become merged in Infidelity. In France, at the end of the last century, the nation threw off religion altogether; and now half the nation is Ultramontane, and the other half Rationalistic. Is the same fate in store for us? Will Rationalism gain the day? or Protestantism? or Catholicism?——or Romanism?

An eminent English statesman, who has also considerable claims to be called a theologian, lately said: "When hosts are mustering and

fields are clearing for the greatest struggle that Christianity has ever had to face, those who should be fighting under the flag of Christianity are quarrelling about trifles; or at least what may be considered relatively as trifles."

Never was the re-union of Christendom more deeply needed; never were the disastrous effects of dis-union so sadly felt, as in the present crisis of the Church. At such a time what do we find to be the state of Christendom? First as to our portion of the Church?

Here in England we find Protestantism revolting against and persecuting Catholicism; we find it shattered into numberless fragments; these various fragments again all hostile and conflicting one with another, and subdivided into other fragments. We find Methodists; these again broken up into Wesleyan Methodists, Methodist New Connexion, Independent Methodists, Primitive Methodists, Bible Christians, United Free Church Methodists, Calvinistic and Welsh Methodists, and Countess of Huntingdon's Connexion. Then again there are Presbyterians; and of these not merely one, but three distinct and opposing bodies, the National Church of Scotland, the Free Church of Scotland, and the United Presbyterian. Then again there are Independents, Baptists, Unitarians, and a host of other sects which it would be as unprofitable, as it is impossible, to enumerate.

And all these sects instead of uniting with the Church against the common enemy, are trying to overthrow it; are vaunting their imaginary numbers, regardless of the fact that after all, they are a mere inharmonious rabble of sects; that they are without cohesion, and without power, except unfortunately the power of doing harm, and of hindering the spread of religion; and that they are thus throwing open the door to Infidelity.

And then if we look beyond our own country, to the general state of Christendom, what do we find there? We find that for eight centuries intercommunion has been suspended between the Eastern and Western Churches; and that the Western Church has for three centuries been divided into two great branches, the Anglican and the Roman. And between these two branches of the Western Church we can see no immediate prospect of re-union. England calls the Pope Antichrist, and the Pope retaliates by calling England schismatical and infidel. And for this internecine and fratricidal enmity we can find no possible cause, but the senseless and uncharitable arrogance of Rome. In the face of General Councils; in spite of Ecclesiastical history, and the authority even of Latin Bishops, Rome claims, not merely a priority of dignity, which might readily be conceded to her, but also of authority and

supremacy over all the Churches of the world. She know that Orders, Sacraments, and Creeds are the terms of intercommnnion between Churches; she knows that she is herself troubled by internal dissensions; that, as Southey says: "in Roman Catholic States Infidelity is as common amongst the higher and better educated clergy, as the grossest superstition is amongst those who are taken with little education from the lower orders of the people;" yet notwithstanding, she rejects all terms of re-union, except such as a Catholic Church could never render her. When Rome becomes Catholic, and will consent to be ruled by the laws and customs of the Catholic Church, then, but not till then, can there be any hope of re-union.

But between the Greek and Anglican Churches, the case is different; great though they are, it is to be hoped no insurmountable impediments stand in the way of a more speedy re-union. Already the bonds of charity and fellowship are being drawn closer between them. "It is a great fact," writes the author of the Eirenicon in 1867, more hopefully perhaps than he could write now, "that in the Greek Church the late Patriarch of Constantinople, together with six members of the Synod, the Metropolitans of Lemnos, Cos, Cyzicus, two Metropolitans from Thessaly, and one from Illyria, venerable and earnest men

from Europe, Asia, the Islands, should have received with expressions of deep satisfaction the commendatary letter of the Archbishop of Canterbury, and others of our Bishops, and expressed themselves grateful for this token of brotherly feeling, and preserved them in the Archives of the Patriarchate, as a memorial of the opening of friendly relations between the two Churches. When besides we find that the like preliminary dispositions to and a desire for re-union were felt and expressed by the Partriarch of Antioch; that the Patriarch of Jerusalem . . . received affectionately one known to have visited the East to promote this re-union; that the Metropolitan of Nazareth greeted the plan as the salvation of the world; that the devout Bishop of Mount Tabor was deeply interested in it; that the Bishops of Homs and Hamor were hearty in their approval; and that the Bishop of Smyrna expressed himself strongly in favour of re-union, what can we say but . . . . 'this is the Lord's doing, and it is marvellous in our eyes?'"

It is true that the visit of the Archbishop of Syros to this country has for a time thrown a cloud over our expectations; and some have feared that the prediction of Pearson two hundred years ago might still be realized; "the schism between the Greek and Latin Churches

began and was continued never to be ended, until those words καὶ ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ, or Filioque are taken out of the Creed." But still the Archbishop clearly recognises the distinction which exists between the Anglican Churches and Protestant Communities. He acknowledges that whilst other Protestants, when they shook off the supremacy of Rome, abolished also Episcopacy, the Anglican Church maintained not only Episcopacy, but also the other tradition and customs of the Ancient Catholic Church. "In this manner" he says: "this Church attached her bark by a strong cable to the ship of the Catholic Church; whilst the other Protestants, having cut the cable, drifted out to sea and wandered away. Whilst on the one hand the other Protestants, beginning with the principle of free inquiry, ended in centring everything in the mere letter of the Bible; in the Anglican Church on the other hand, there was gradually developed a feeling of reverence for religious ordinances, the depth and warmth of which is felt, not only in the Church, but also in public, as well as in social and family life."

When the highest dignitaries of the Greek Church can speak in terms of affection, and thus bear witness to the Catholic character of our Church; when it is remembered also that great statesmen and others, and we may in-

stance the Grand Duke Constantine, are in favour of the movement, surely there must be some grounds for hope, even though there are difficulties to be surmounted, of a speedy re-union. That the Greek Church should acknowledge our Catholicity is a great point gained; and if we would only adopt our rightful name of Catholics, this point would no doubt be greatly strengthened. For when in the last century an attempt was made to bring about the re-union of the Churches, it failed mainly through the Anglican Bishops calling themselves Protestants, and thus leading the Greek Bishops to believe that we are Lutherans and not Catholics. But now that this is cleared up, and the Catholicity of our Church acknowledged; surely the points of difference between the two Churches ought not to be held essential; or such as cannot be removed by toleration; or that one Church cannot concede to that liberty, which in matters not immediately affecting doctrine, is allowable to every independent Church. As to the "Filioque" clause in the Nicene Creed, unfortunate as its introduction undoubtedly was, yet now that it has been introduced and remained in the Creed for so many centuries, we may hope that its retention will some day commend itself even to our opponents as necessary; for in these days of increasing unbelief, it would

be impossible to omit that clause without exciting suspicion, and laying the Church open to the imputation of denying the Second Person in the Trinity. During the last Session of Convocation, attention was drawn by Canon Selwyn to a very important fact, which shows that our Church at least does not consider this difference vital: viz., that it was once proposed to append a note at the end of the Nicene Creed, in these words: "It is humbly submitted to Convocation whether a note ought not to be added, with relation to the Greek Church, in order to our maintaining Catholic Communion."

That there are other difficulties in the way—particularly as to the time for observing Easter—must be allowed; but it is hoped they are not such as by mutual charity, or forbearance, might not be conceded or removed.

The difficulty with Rome is certainly greater than with the Eastern Church; but it ought not, it cannot be, insurmountable. For surely there is reason to hope that Rome, sobered by adversity, spiritualized by the loss of her temporal power, and induced by the wishes of Romanists, may be inclined to draw nearer to a Church which during the last forty years has so materially broken down the barriers, and narrowed the gulf that separates them. But

that the attempt has been made, that an Association for promoting the Union of Christendom has been formed, and met with great success; that, notwithstanding the opposition of Rome, it continues to enlist Romanists, men, too, of distinction, amongst its members; that a beginning has been made, inspires hope as to its completion. "Si jamais les Chrétiens se rapprochent," says De Maistre, "comme tout les y invite, il semble que la motion doit partir de l'Eglise de l'Angleterre." England has triumphed over Protestant bigotry, and has done her part.

Surely the sense of a common danger ought to convince the Catholic Churches of Christendom of the need of union. When the enemy is at the gates, it is not time to send out skirmishers, and parties to reconnoitre, and thus be beaten in detail.

"Defendit numeras, junctæque umbone phalanges."

At such a time the Church requires a thorough organization and combination of all her forces under their respective Bishops; the Latin Church under the Pope of Rome; the Eastern Church under the Patriarch of Constantinople; the Teutonic Church under the Archbishop of Canterbury. "The breaking down of national barriers," writes a Romanist, "and class prejudice on the one hand, and the more open

assaults of Infidelity on the other, upon the fundamental tenets of Revelation, are almost forcing Christian believers into closer relations, and a better appreciation of each other." The three great branches of the Catholic Church would, if combined, soon absorb into themselves the various sects of Protestantism, and thus isolate and overcome the forces of Infidelity.

When the power of the Church and the power of Infidelity are brought, as they will be some day, into open conflict, which side will Rome take in the battle? Will she ally herself to the friends, or, by standing aloof, aid the enemies of Christianity? In the present day, it must be feared, Rome thinks of nothing but supporting in every country her own hierarchy, not only against the authority of the State, but against the Church itself; she scoffs at all idea of tolerance and ridicules equality. Her position and influence in England is very different from what it has been at any previous time since the Reformation. For nearly one hundred years after the Revolution, Romanists had been excluded from the benefits which under the Toleration Act had been accorded to Protestant Dissenters. In 1791 a Bill was passed by which, on taking a prescribed oath, they were exempted from the Acts of Recusancy passed against them in the reign of Elizabeth, as well

as from the oaths of supremacy and against Transubstantiation. They were however incapable of holding any civil or military offices, or of sitting in either House of Parliament. Nor were these disabilities removed, or Romanists admitted to the same rights as other Dissenters, till the abrogation of the Test and Corporation Acts in 1828, and the passing of the Catholic Emancipation Act in 1829. Since then the number of Romanists and Roman Chapels in England has greatly increased; for whereas the latter at the beginning of the century was only about two hundred, in fifty years it had increased to six hundred; whilst the establishment of the Roman Hierarchy in England, which so late as the Pontificate of Gregory XVI. was considered impracticable, is a proof of Roman energy and boldness.

Even the loss of the temporal power seems to have enhanced her spiritual authority. By the exercise of the spiritual sword Rome still claims to rule the world. It is this power which even now, as we write, has overthrown the strongest and most popular Government which for many years has existed in England. Protestantism in Ireland had long enjoyed a monopoly of Education. It was proposed therefore, to establish a National University in that country, independent of Creeds. Objections to such a Bill on the part of Protestants

were perhaps not unreasonable. But it is not at first sight so easy to understand what objection Romanists could make to a Bill, the undoubted object of which was to benefit them. As such, Liberal Romanists were willing to accept it. But no: Rome would admit of no compromise; she would not listen to equality; she must have all, or would accept nothing. "Roma locuta est." She reminded the Irish members of an approaching election; her sentence had gone forth; and the most liberal and the strongest Government which England has known of late years fell, doomed by the anathema of the Roman Curia.

Who can doubt that in Rome we have a very powerful and dangerous antagonist? Witness the number of Convents, Churches, and Seminaries that are rising up on all sides, testifying to her increasing strength. She is all the more dangerous, because she knows and makes profit from our weakness; she ridicules our dissensions, and she boasts of her own unity; and we fear it is not too much to say, that she would sooner gain one convert from the rank of the Anglican Church, than twenty from Infidelity.

The power of Rome in England is unquestionably on the increase. Infidelity also is on the increase, whilst both draw their converts, almost exclusively, from those who have

been born and bred in a narrow and exclusive Protestantism. Ritualism has opposed an effectual barrier against Rome's progress: and the reason of this is evident. It meets her on her own ground, fights her with her own weapons, and condemns her out of her own mouth. Rome appeals to antiquity; it can be proved from antiquity, from the early Councils, and the whole history of the Church, that the doctrines and usurped supremacy of Rome are not primitive, but at the furthest mediæval, and uncatholic. But the Anglican Church is Catholic, and, if untrammelled by the State, is ready to do battle, single-handed if necessary, against the combined forces of Rationalism and Ultramontanism. All she asks is a fair field and no favour. As all other systems have failed in drawing the masses of the population, and preventing the spread of Rationalism, she claims the right to take her turn; to employ in her service all the grandeur of Ritual, all the beauty of holiness, of which her Liturgy is capable; she only demands that that liberty and toleration which are the cry of the present day, and which are conceded to Nonconformist bodies, may not be denied to her, simply because she happens to be the Established Religion of the land. She must therefore be allowed to do her own work, and teach her own people in her own way.

And how is she to do this?

Firstly. There must be a revival of her Church Discipline. In the present day Episcopal authority is almost wholly in abeyance; the Bishop has no opportunity of speaking *ex cathedrâ*; his godly judgments and admonitions are the utterances of the man, not the Bishop. So that Diocesan and Provincial Synods must be restored. In Synod the Bishop would take counsel with the Presbyters of his Diocese; together they could arrange matters of discipline, disputed points as well of Ritual as of Doctrine; the Bishop would then have power to decide causes *ex cathedrâ* and avoid that great scandal to religion, the necessity of going to law often before the unbelievers.

Convocation also must be remodelled. It is not, as at present constituted, in any sense the voice of the Church. In the first place, all the Bishops in the Upper House are the nominees of the Crown. Then in the Lower House many of the members are nominees of the Bishops; more than two-thirds are *ex officio* members, or nominees of Cathedral Chapters; not elected by, and therefore not necessarily representatives of, the Church.

Secondly, which is of still greater importance: a reform is needed, as well in the mode of electing Bishops, as with regard to the

number of the Episcopate. The election of Bishop nominally devolves upon the Sovereign, but practically on the Prime Minister. Both plans are equally objectionable. For what can either the Sovereign or Prime Minister, as a rule, be expected to know of the special requirements of a diocese, or the suitableness of a Bishop. The present Prime Minister, no doubt, from his high moral character, his theological attainments, and his extensive acquaintance with churchmen, is an exception. But a Prime Minister may be a Presbyterian, or even an unbeliever. Is that the person to be entrusted with the highest appointments in the Church? Or is a Prime Minister, immediately on his appointment transferred, as by a magician's wand, into an Ecclesiastic? It is no disparagement to that great Statesman, Lord Palmerston, to say that he had a better eye for a horse, than he had for a Bishop. True, he was sensible of his failing, and he appointed a deputy to manage the appointment of Bishops for him. The intention was good, but the execution bad. For in his innocence he imagined that as long as his deputy was a religious man, no other requisite was necessary: accordingly he chose, no doubt, a religious man, but the worst, because the most narrow-minded one, he could have selected. And so the Bishops whom he appointed were men all fash-

ioned in the same groove, some as narrow-minded as himself; "benè nati, modicè docti," with a strong flavour of Calvinism in their composition;—those were the requisites for bishops. And thus he had the unhappy propensity of putting square men with angular Protestantism into Episcopal square holes; till at length the appointments became a laughing-stock; even the existence of the Government was threatened; the deputy resigned his functions, and henceforward the Prime Minister trusted to his own ingenuity.

Still more absurd than the election of a Bishop by the Prime Minister, is the *congé d'elire*. It is fortunate that a foreign title is given to this very anomalous proceeding; for to present a license in sober English to the Chapter of a Cathedral conveying the Sovereign's permission to them to elect a Bishop, whilst at the same time a pistol, in the shape of a Præmunire, is presented at the Dean's head, in case he refuse to accept a person already elected, would be an abuse of the English language; as it is, the whole thing, on such a solemn occasion, is bad, it is only such that, through lack of an English word, we must describe by a Greek word, from which an ugly English one is derived—*ὑπόκρισις*.

A change then must be made in the mode of election, so as to give the Clergy and faithful

Laity, a voice in the election of their own Bishops.

And then comes the question as to the increase of the Episcopate; how is it to be effected? Since the reign of Henry VIII., with the exception of two Bishops, no addition has been made to their numbers. It must be borne in mind that in the present day the character of the Episcopate and the duties of a Bishop, are entirely different from the Reformation times. Bishops, now-a-days, are not Lord Chancellors, or Lord Keepers of the Privy Seal, or Masters of the Rolls. With the destruction of the monasteries, the days of William of Wykeham, Waynfleet, and Wolsey, departed, never to return. At that time Bishops were men with large estates, great wealth, and influence in the House of Lords, so that they could withstand encroachments upon the Church. Thus in the twelfth century they constituted six-sevenths; whilst in the eighteenth century they had diminished to one-eighth, and are now only one-fourteenth of the whole House.

The number of Bishops in the House of Lords is too small to be of any material use; could not their attendance be profitably dispensed with? Would they not be better employed in their Dioceses? They were not able to prevent the Divorce Bill, nor (much as

they wished it) the Disestablishment of the Irish Church, nor the imposition of the Conscience Clause. It is true they have lately been instrumental in passing two Bills, the Benefices' Resignation, and the Bishops' Resignation Acts; but it is doubtful whether a comparison of the two will redound much to their credit for disinterestedness, or even to their self-respect. By the former of these Acts, an aged or worn-out Incumbent retires on one-third, at the most, of his income; possibly on less; without the Parsonage, and without the power of holding any other cure with his pension. Far otherwise is it with the Bill affecting their Right Reverend and Most Reverend Lordships. A Bishop retires on between half and two-thirds; the Archbishop of York on more than two-thirds, and the Archbishop of Canterbury on nearly three-fourths, of their respective incomes. In each case the Bishop or Archbishop retains the Palace, and may (if appointed to it) hold with the pension the best living in the Church. Surely it must strike every one that an ex-Archbishop of Canterbury with £11,000 a year, a Palace, a seat in the House of Lords, and nothing to do, is an anachronism.

But perhaps this Bill, as approved by their Lordships, may solve the difficulty as to the increase of the Episcopate. We want at least

double the number of Bishops; how is that increase to be obtained? If, (as it would appear from the Bishops' Resignation Act), £4000 a year, without a palace, is sufficient for a *working* Archbishop of Canterbury, and £2000 a year for Bishops, the sooner they are reduced to these figures the better. By such a diminution, double the number of Bishops might be provided for.

Bishops speak of the expense of entertaining guests as necessitating large incomes. S. Paul mentions one of the requisites of a Bishop that he should be "given to hospitality." That need surely entail no great expense; scarcely more in comparison than is expected of most clergymen.

Is a Palace and £5000 a year necessary for a Bishop? One Bishop, in a speech on the occasion of laying the first stone of the Keble College at Oxford, proposed that Bishops should go on "half pay," and he has nobly set the example. The necessity of an increase in the number of Bishops has already been recognised in some Dioceses, where the Bishop has voluntarily cut down his income by the payment of Suffragan Bishops. Why should not some such plan, although in a more permanent form, become universal? Why should not the Upper House of Convocation propose the change? It must come some day; but

then perhaps the Episcopal endowments may be diverted, as was the case with the Irish Church, into some other channel, and thus the opportunity be lost. If Bishops would only take the initiative; if they would provide for, as they acknowledge the necessity of, an increase in the Episcopate, the chief and most reasonable objection urged by the Liberationists against the Church would be removed; the disinterestedness of the Bishops would redound to the credit of the Church; would enlist the admiration even of Nonconformists; and prove the most effectual means of promoting the lengthened existence of that which Bishops hold to be of great importance to the Church, viz., the Establishment.

Thirdly: One most important point, probably the most important of all, is with regard to Education. The Church must exert all her power to prevent Parliament from secularising Education. As long as there is an Established Church, it must be the undoubted duty of that Church to superintend the religious education of those who are willing to receive her ministration, and to take care that they do not grow up as unbelievers. Notwithstanding all assertions to the contrary, it has been established as a fact that in the immense majority of cases, parents do not object to religious Instruction or religious Inspection;

the objections that are raised proceed not from the parents, but secularists, and the enemies of the Established Church.

It is indeed strange that people professing liberal opinions, should wish to deprive parents of the liberty of claiming a religious education for their children; or deprive children of that instruction which, in many cases, is the sole means of rescuing them from growing up as heathens. It is the duty of the Church to take steps against a danger so imminent, agitated as it is by a small, but a noisy and factious, minority; who in order to weaken the Church, would rob the poor of the scanty inheritance which they possess; and of the liberty which, in a Christian land, all have a right to demand from the State, a Christian education.

Fourthly: Another pressing duty of the Church is, to render religion less dull and monotonous than it often is; to make it more attractive, and thus to draw to itself the poor and uneducated classes. With this view, the services of the Church must be made more elastic; there must be greater variety, and less uniformity. Uniformity has been in times past, and to a great extent is at present the great bane of the Church: it has driven thousands out of the Church, and forced them to seek in Dissent a more attractive and a more reason-

able service. For it cannot be expected that the same kind of service and the same ritual, is suited alike to rich and poor, learned and unlearned. For the poor we want free and open Churches; numerous missions, frequent services, and frequent Celebrations. The Church must be all things to all men, that she may gain some. She must provide short services for the poor, simple services for the uneducated. A plain service may suit some, a choral service others; but to the poor and uneducated, an ornate Ritual with grand music, and rich vestments, and all the external beauty of holiness, generally commends itself. Why should not the Church be less stiff? Why should she repel people, because she is fettered by the State? Why should she not be allowed the same liberty as Dissenters, and make religion as suitable as possible to the masses, without incurring the wrath of the Church Association, or of the Privy Council? "Awake, awake; put on thy strength, O Zion; put on thy beautiful garments, O Jerusalem, the Holy City."

The religion which endeavours to establish such services, although it seeks to establish nothing new, but only to revive customs which in better and purer times were found beneficial, but which lately have fallen into desuetude, is by some ridiculed as a novelty, and sneeringly termed Ritualism.

England, professedly liberal in politics, is ecclesiastically wellnigh the most Conservative and bigoted nation in the world. In religion she hates anything that deviates from established custom. It would be the same if Protestantism or Nonconformity came to the fore, and introduced practices which however useful, were opposed to the habits or luxuries of the day. It is only just to say that this opposition to Ritualism has for the most part died out. But it is a serious, as it is an undoubted fact, that it lies between Ritualism and Rationalism what shall be the future religion of England, or whether there shall be any religion at all. If Ritualism is defeated, then Romanism will come to the front; and then the battle will be between Rationalism and Romanism. Which would England prefer, to be Roman or Rationalistic? If she would avoid either alternative, then let her take her stand on the safe ground of the Catholic Faith, which has saved the Church through persecutions and trials for 1800 years, and is now the only bulwark against the dangers that surround her.

If Ritualism is a sham, by all means let it be put down: but not by persecution, or the arm of the civil law, but by learning and argument. But Ritualism is a practical realiy; in proof of which, witness the decreasing profanation of Holy Seasons; the more general observance of

Saints' Days; the increase of daily Matins and Evensong; of Fasting and Choral Celebrations; all of these are improvements which few will deny to be more or less directly attributable to this later development of the Catholic movement; and which, if they had only been matters of external observance, would never have gained a hold on so practical and unimaginative a people as the English.

But Rationalism has already made great inroads on the faith of England. It may be that Ritualism has taken the field too late: that the Rationalism of Germany may be the religion, or rather the irreligion of England. But of one thing we may be certain; if Catholicism or Ritualism—for we speak of the two as different aspects of the same thing—can do little to satisfy the social and scientific progress of the day, any other religion would do still less.

For there is one essential requisite which Ritualism brings to the controversy, and that is learning, and a knowledge of Theology and of the early Fathers; it appeals not only to the heart, but the understanding also; never puts faith in opposition to the just limits of the human intellect; and, unlike Rome, it courts inquiry.

But Ritualism has a hard task before it. It must set itself against the feelings of a bigoted and luxurious age; it must set itself against the

current of religious thought, and that political legislation, which pampers the religious apathy of the day; it must set itself perhaps in open hostility to the powers that be; for if Parliament continues to root up the old landmarks of the Church, and insists upon dissociating education from religion, it is taking the surest and most effectual measures for rendering the children of the next generation, not only Rationalists or Infidels, but also Socialists.

London: Swift & Co., Regent Press, King Street, Regent Street, W.

January, 1873.

WORKS

PUBLISHED BY

J. T. HAYES, LYALL PLACE, EATON SQUARE;

AND

4, HENRIETTA STREET, COVENT GARDEN.

BY REV. W. J. E. BENNETT.

THE "MISSION" SERMONS AT S. PAUL'S, KNIGHTSBRIDGE, in 1869. By Rev. W. J. E. BENNETT, Froome-Selwood. 7*s.* 6*d.*; by post, 8*s.*

A PLEA FOR TOLERATION IN THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND. By W. J. E. BENNETT. Fourth and Cheap Edition. 1*s.*; by post, 1*s.* 1*d.*

OBEDIENCE TO THE LESSER, (The State); DISOBEDIENCE TO THE GREATER, (The Church). By W. J. E. BENNETT. 6*d.*; by post, 7*d.*

AGAINST STATE INTERFERENCE IN MATTERS SPIRITUAL: A Reprint from a work entitled "*Remains of Richard Hurrell Froude.*" Preface by W. J. E. BENNETT. 2*s.*; by post, 2*s.* 2*d.*

THE CHURCH'S BROKEN UNITY. Edited by W. J. E. BENNETT, Froome-Selwood. Vol. I., PRESBYTERIANISM AND IRVINGISM. Vol. II., ANABAPTISM, INDEPENDENCY, AND QUAKERS. Vol. III., ON METHODISM, AND THE SWEDENBORGIANS. Each of the first Three Volumes 3*s.* 6*d.*; by post, 3*s.* 10*d.* Vols. IV. and V., ON ROMANISM. Each, 4*s.* 6*d.*; by post, 4*s.* 10*d.*

LITURGICAL, &c. (*continued.*)

SANCTA CLARA ON THE THIRTY-NINE ARTICLES. Reprinted from the Edition in Latin of 1646, with a Translation, together with Expositions and Comments in English from the Theological Problems and Propositions of the same writer, and with additional Notes and References. Edited by the Rev. FREDERICK GEORGE LEE, D.C.L. 5*s.*; by post, 5*s.* 5*d.*

RITUAL EXPLANATIONS. By Rev. C. J. ELIOT, sometime Fellow of Corpus Christi College. 4*d.*; post, 5*d.*

The subjects dealt with are:—The Separation of the Sexes during Public Worship—The Rising of the Congregation at the Entrance and Departure of the Priests—Reverent Inclination of the Body at sundry portions of the Service—Choral Celebrations and Eucharistic Ritual and the Worship of non-Communicants—The mixing of a little Water with the Wine—The Sequence of Colours—Processions with Cross and Banners on solemn occasions.

BY C. E. WILLING.

THE BOOK OF COMMON PRAISE: HYMNS WITH TUNES FOR THE SERVICE OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND. Arranged and principally composed by C. E. WILLING, Organist of the Foundling, and late of All Saints', Margaret-street. To which are added Chants for the Magnificat and Nunc Dimittis, and Responses for Advent and Lent, as sung at All Saints; with fourteen new Double Chants, &c.

a. HYMNS & TUNES. Bound in cloth, 3*s.* 6*d.*; postage, 4*d.*

b. THE SAME. Limp cloth flush, 2*s.* 6*d.*; postage, 3½*d.*

c. TUNES ONLY. Suitable for Hymns Ancient and Modern, the People's Hymnal, and all the modern Hymn Books. Bound in cloth, 1*s.* 6*d.*; postage, 2*d.*

d. THE SAME. Limp cloth flush, 1*s.*; postage, 2*d.*

e. WORDS OF HYMNS ONLY. Bound in cloth, 8*d.*; postage, 1½*d.*

f. THE SAME. Limp cloth, 6*d.*; postage, 1*d.*

THE PSALTER, CANTICLES, AND THE PROPER PSALMS FOR CERTAIN DAYS. Pointed for Chanting by C. E. WILLING. 2*s.*; by post, 2*s.* 8½*d.* Cheap Edition, 1*s.*; by post, 1*s.* 2½*d.*

THE CANTICLES, EASTER ANTHEMS, AND ATHANASIAN CREED. Pointed for Chanting by C. E. WILLING. 3*d.*; postage, ½*d.*; per dozen, nett, 2*s.* 6*d.*

SAFE HOME! Funeral Hymn. By the late Rev. Dr. NEALE; Music by C. E. WILLING. 4*d.*; postage, ½*d.*

HISTORICAL, THEOLOGICAL, DOCTRINAL, ETC.

A COMMENTARY ON THE AUTHORIZED VERSION OF THE GOSPEL OF ST. JOHN. Compared with the Sinaitic, Vatican, and Alexandrian MSS.; also with Dean ALFORD'S Revised Translation. By Rev. F. H. DUNWELL, Hensall (late Hastings Exhibitioner, Queen's College, Oxford). 15*s.*; postage, 9*d.*

THE ARMENIAN CHURCH; Its History, Liturgy, Doctrine, and Ceremonies. By E. F. K. FORTESCUE. With an Appendix by Rev. S. C. MALAN, Vicar of Broadwindsor, etc. 7*s.* 6*d.*; by post, 8*s.* Illustrated.

A HISTORY OF THE CHURCH. FROM THE DAY OF PENTECOST TO THE GREAT SCHISM BETWEEN EAST AND WEST. By C. A. JONES, Author of "Church Stories for Sundays," &c. With Preface by Rev. Dr. LITTLEDALE; and Dedicated to Rev. W. J. E. Bennett. 6*s.*; by post, 6*s.* 4½*d.*

BIBLE HISTORY (OLD TESTAMENT); From the Foundation of the World to the Return of the Jews from Captivity. By C. A. JONES, Author of "A History of the Church," &c. 6*s.*; postage, 5*d.*

BIBLE HISTORY (NEW TESTAMENT); From the Birth of Our Lord to the Establishment of Christianity. By C. A. JONES, Author of "A History of the Church," &c. 6*s.*; Postage, 5*d.*

THE BABEL OF THE SECTS AND THE UNITY OF PENTECOST. By Rev. H. T. EDWARDS, Carnarvon. 2*s.* 6*d.*; by post, 2*s.* 8*d.*

ESSAYS ON THE RE-UNION OF CHRISTENDOM. BY MEMBERS OF THE ENGLISH, ROMAN, AND GREEK CHURCHES. Introductory Essay by Rev. Dr. PUSEY. 6*s.*; by post, 6*s.* 4*d.*

SERMONS ON THE RE-UNION OF CHRISTEN-DOM. BY MEMBERS OF THE ENGLISH, ROMAN, AND GREEK CHURCHES. First and Second Series. Each Volume 5*s.*; by post, 5*s.* 4*d.*

PHARISAIC PROSELYTISM: A FORGOTTEN CHAPTER IN EARLY CHURCH HISTORY. By Rev. Dr. LITTLEDALE. 1s.; by post, 1*s.* 1*d.*

HISTORICAL, THEOLOGICAL, DOCTRINAL, &c.
(*continued.*)

STORIES ABOUT THE GREAT KING: for the Little Ones of the Church of England. By Rev. W. H. B. PROBY, Author of "Lessons on the Kingdom." 3*s.* 6*d.*; postage, 3*d.*

LESSONS ON THE KINGDOM: for the Little Ones. (Second Edition.) By Author of "Stories about the Great King." 2*s.*; by post 2*s.* 2*d.*

THE FATHERS OF THE CHURCH: being the Lives of St. Clement of Rome—St. Ignatius—St. Polycarp—St. Justin—St. Irenæus—Tertullian—St. Clement of Alexandria—Origen. By Author of "Tales of Kirkbeck." 5*s.*; by post, 5*s.* 5*d.*

THE KISS OF PEACE; or, **ENGLAND AND ROME AT ONE ON THE HOLY EUCHARIST.** By GERARD F. COBB. 7*s.* 6*d.*; by post, 8*s.*

SEQUEL TO THE KISS OF PEACE. 5*s.* 6*d.*; by post, 5*s.* 10*d.* (This new matter may be had separately by purchasers of the Original Essay.)

THE UNION REVIEW: A Magazine of Catholic Literature and Art. By Contributors of the Anglican, Greek, and Roman Churches. In Bi-monthly Nos., 2*s.* each; by post, 2*s.* 2*d.* Annual Subscription, 12*s.*

A.P.U.C.—CORPORATE RE-UNION, NOT INDIVIDUAL SECESSION: Two Sermons. By Rev. W. H. P. WARD and DR. LITTLEDALE. 6*d.*; by post, 7*d.*

SOUR GRAPES OF DIS-UNION. A Sermon by Rev. Dr. LEE. 6*d.*; by post, 7*d.*

A COMPARISON OF THE FUNDAMENTAL DOCTRINES of the Anglican and Greek Churches. By Rev. J. O. BAGDON. 1*s.*; by post, 1*s.* 1*d.*

FUTURE UNITY OF THE CHRISTIAN FAMILY. By Rev. T. CARTER, Clewer. 1*s.*; by post, 1*s.* 1*d.*

THE HOLY EASTERN CHURCH. Preface by Rev. Dr. LITTLEDALE. 3*s.* 6*d.*; by post, 3*s.* 10*d.*

PERE GRATRY ON PAPAL INFALLIBILITY. 3*s.* 6*d.*, cloth; by post, 3*s.* 10*d.*

REDEMPTION: SOME ASPECTS OF THE WORK OF CHRIST CONSIDERED. By Rev. R. M. BENSON, Evangelist Father, Cowley. 5*s.*; by post, 5*s.* 6*d.*

SERMONS, ON DOCTRINE AND PRACTICE. By Rev. Dr. OLDKNOW, Bordesley. 4*s.*; by post 4*s.* 3*d.*

PROTESTANT OR CATHOLIC? A Lecture at Cambridge. By Rev. S. BARING-GOULD, Author of "Curiosities of Olden Time," &c. 6*d.*; by post, 7*d.*

HISTORICAL, THEOLOGICAL, DOCTRINAL, &c.
(*continued.*)

THE CHURCH'S COMPREHENSIVENESS.—THE IDEA AND DUTY. An Address at Leeds Congress, 1872. By Rev. Dr. IRONS. 6*d.* by post 6½*d.*

THE SACRED LIFE OF OUR LORD JESUS CHRIST. (A Reading Book for Children.) By the Rev. Dr. IRONS. 1*s.*; by post, 1*s.* 1*d.*

THE SACRED WORDS OF OUR LORD JESUS CHRIST. By the Rev. Dr. IRONS. 2*s*; by post, 2*s.* 2*d.*

ATHANASIUS CONTRA MUNDUM. By Rev. Dr. IRONS, Prebendary of S. Paul's, and Rector of St. Mary's, Woolnoth. 3*s.* 6*d.*; by post, 3*s.* 9*d.*

THE BIBLE AND ITS INTERPRETERS: ITS MIRACLES AND PROPHECIES. By Dr. IRONS, Second Edition. 6*s.*; by post, 6*s.* 6*d.*

A YEAR WITH GREAT PREACHERS; or, SERMONS UPON THE GOSPELS FOR EVERY SUNDAY AND FESTIVAL IN THE YEAR. Edited from the Latin: By J. M. ASHLEY, B.C.L., S. Peter's, Vere Street. In Two Vols.—I. Advent to Whitsun Day; II. Trinity-tide. Each (separate) 5*s.*; postage 4½*d.*

A FESTIVAL YEAR WITH GREAT PREACHERS; Or, Sermons for every Festival in the Year. Edited, from the Latin, by J. M. ASHLEY. 6*s.*; by post, 6*s.* 6*d.*

THE LITTLE ONES IN SUNDAY SCHOOLS; or, A NEW AND INTERESTING WAY OF TEACHING HOLY SCRIPTURE TO YOUNG CHILDREN. Part I. Edited by Rev. W. W. LA BARTE. 5*s.*; by post, 5*s.* 4*d.*

A DIGEST OF THE DOCTRINE OF S. THOMAS AQUINAS ON THE MYSTERY OF THE INCARNATION. By the Author of "A Digest of the Doctrine of S. Thomas on the Sacraments." 6*s.*; by post, 6*s.* 4*d.*

MEMORANDA OF ANGELICAL DOCTRINE FROM LADY DAY TO THE ASCENSION: being Notes on the Nativity, Circumcision, Temptation, Passion, Death, Burial, Descent into Hell, Resurrection, Ascension, of our Blessed Lord. By the same Author. 1*s.* 6*d.*; by post, 1*s.* 7*d.*

A DIGEST OF THE DOCTRINE OF S. THOMAS AQUINAS ON THE SACRAMENTS. By the same Author. 7*s.*; by post, 7*s.* 5*d.*

BY THE LATE REV. DR. NEALE.

SERMONS FOR CHILDREN. Third Edition. By the late Rev. Dr. NEALE. 3*s.* 6*d.*; by post, 3*s.* 9*d.*

CATECHETICAL NOTES AND CLASS QUESTIONS: Literal and Mystical. Second Edition. By the late Rev. Dr. NEALE. 5*s.*; by post, 5*s.* 5*d.*

NEALE AND BENNETT ON "CHURCH DIFFICULTIES." 6*s.*; by Post, 6*s.* 6*d.*

SERMONS ON THE APOCALYPSE—On the NAME OF JESUS; and on the last Chapter of PROVERBS. By the late Rev. Dr NEALE. 5*s.*; by post, 5*s.* 4*d.*

SERMONS ON PASSAGES OF "THE PSALMS." By the late Rev. Dr. NEALE. 5*s.*; by post, 5*s.* 4*d.*

"THE SONG OF SONGS." A Volume of beautiful Sermons thereon. By the late Rev. J. M. NEALE. Edited by the Rev. J. HASKOLL. *Many are added which have never hitherto been published.* Second Edition, considerably Enlarged, 6*s.*; by post, 6*s.* 4*d.*

ORIGINAL SEQUENCES, HYMNS, AND OTHER ECCLESIASTICAL VERSES. By the late Rev. Dr. NEALE. 2*s.* 6*d.*; by post, 2*s.* 9*d.*

STABAT MATER SPECIOSA: FULL OF BEAUTY STOOD THE MOTHER. By the late Rev. J. M. NEALE. Now first translated. 1*s.*; by post, 1*s.* 2*d.*

HYMNS SUITABLE FOR INVALIDS, ORIGINAL or Translated, by the late Rev. J. M. NEALE. With a Preface by the Rev. Dr. LITTLEDALE. In paper cover, 6*d.*; by Post, 7*d.*; in cloth, 1*s.*; by Post 1*s.* 1*d.* A fine Edition on Toned Paper, cloth, 2*s.*; by post, 2*s.* 2*d.*

THE RHYTHM OF BERNARD OF MORLAIX, on the CELESTIAL COUNTRY. Edited and Translated by the late Rev. J. M. NEALE. New Edition, beautifully printed on Toned Paper. 2*s.* in cloth; by Post, 2*s.* 2*d.*; in French morocco, 4*s.* 6*d.*; by Post, 4*s.* 9*d.*; in morocco, 7*s.* 6*d.*; by post, 7*s.* 9*d.* Cheap edition 9*d.*; by post, 10*d.*

HYMNS, CHIEFLY MEDIÆVAL, ON THE JOYS and GLORIES of PARADISE. By the late Rev. J. M. NEALE. Companion Volume to "The Rhythm of Bernard of Morlaix." 1*s.* 6*d.*; by post, 1*s.* 7*d.*

THE REVISION OF THE LECTIONARY. A Letter to the late Bp. of Salisbury. 1*s.*; by post, 1*s.* 1*d.*

BY THE LATE REV. DR. NEALE (*continued.*)

SERMONS ON BLESSED SACRAMENT. By the Rev. J. M. NEALE. Third Edition. 2*s.* 6*d.*; by Post, 2*s.* 9*d.*

NOTES, ECCLESIOLOGICAL & PICTURESQUE, on DALMATIA, CROATIA, &c.; with a visit to MONTENEGRO. By the late Rev. J. M. NEALE. 6*s.*; by post, 6*s.* 4*d.*

THE PRIMITIVE LITURGIES (in Greek) **OF S.** MARK, S. CLEMENT, S. JAMES, S. CHRYSOSTOM, AND S. BASIL. Edited by the late Dr. NEALE. Preface by Dr. LITTLEDALE. Second Edition. 6*s.*; by post, 6*s.* 4*d.* Calf, 10*s.* 6*d.* (for Presents); by post, 11*s.*

THE LITURGY OF S. MARK. And, **THE** LITURGY OF S. JAMES. In Greek. By the late Rev. J. M. NEALE. 1*s.* each; by post, 1*s.* 1*d.*

THE TRANSLATIONS OF THE PRIMITIVE LITURGIES OF SS. MARK, JAMES, CLEMENT, CHRYSOSTOM and BASIL, and THE CHURCH OF MALABAR. With Introduction and Appendices, by the late Rev. J. M. NEALE, D.D., and the Rev. R. F. LITTLEDALE, LL.D. Second Edition, enlarged. 4*s.*; by post, 4*s.* 4*d.*

THE HYMNS OF THE EASTERN CHURCH: Translated by late Rev. J. M. NEALE, D.D. New and larger type Edition. 2*s.* 6*d.*; by post, 2*s.* 9*d.*

"THE CHRISTIAN NURSE;" AND HER MISSION IN THE SICK ROOM. Translated from the French of Father Gautrelet, by one of the Sisters of S. Margaret's, East Grinstead; and Edited by the late Rev. J. M. NEALE. 2*s.*; by post, 2*s.* 1*d.*

AN INVALUABLE SERMON HELP—THE MORAL CONCORDANCES OF S. ANTONY OF PADUA. Translated, Verified, and Adapted to Modern Use, by Rev. J. M. NEALE; with Additions from the "*Promptuarium Morale Sacræ*" of THOMAS HIBERNICUS, an Irish Franciscan of the 14th Century. With Preface by Dr. LITTLEDALE. Third Edition. 3*s.* 6*d.*; by post, 3*s.* 9*d.*

TEXT EMBLEMS: Twelve beautiful Designs, engraved by Dalziel, illustrating the Mystical Interpretation of as many Verses from the Old Testament. By the late Rev. J. M. NEALE. Second Edition. 2*s.*; by post, 2*s.* 2*d.*

ON MEDITATION, DEVOTION, &c.

ON PAROCHIAL MISSIONS: the New Volume of the EVANGELIST LIBRARY. 2*s.* 6*d.*; postage, 2*d.*

THE EVANGELIST LIBRARY CATECHISM. PART I. By the Evangelist Fathers, Cowley. 3*s.*; by post, 3*s.* 3*d.*

THE MANUAL OF INTERCESSORY PRAYER. Edited by Rev. R. M. BENSON. Limp cloth, 9*d.*; cloth boards, 1*s.* 3*d.*; Postage, 1*d.*

TRACTS BY THE EVANGELIST FATHERS. A packet of all Published. 1*s.* 8*d*; by post, 1*s.* 10*d.*

CONFERENCES WITH GOD; being Meditations for Every Day of the Year. By C. C. STURM. Translated from the German by a Layman. Second Edition, 640 pages. 6*s.*; by post, 6*s.* 6*d.*

SHORT DEVOTIONS, primarily for the Young; with the Collects and Psalms of David. 1*s.* 6*d.*; by post, 1*s.* 8*d.* An Edition without the Psalms of David, 6*d.*; by post, 7*d.*

THE LITURGY OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND: An Altar Manual for Hearers or Communicants. Limp Cloth, 1*s.* 1*d.*; Stiff Cloth, 1*s.* 3*d.* Postage, 1*d.*

MANUAL OF DEVOTIONS FOR THE BLESSED SACRAMENT, ATTENDANCE, COMMUNION, PREPARATION, and THANKSGIVING. With Preface by the Rev. FREDERICK G. LEE, D.C.L. 32mo. Editions: limp cloth, 6*d.*; boards, 1*s.*; postage, 1*d.* In calf, 3*s.* 6*d.*; by post, 3*s.* 7*d.* 12mo. Edition, 1*s.* 6*d.*; by post, 1*s.* 7*d.*

THE HOLY OBLATION; A Manual of Doctrine, Instructions, and Devotions relative to the Blessed Eucharist. By an ANGLO-CATHOLIC PRIEST. In roan, 2*s.*; in morocco, 4*s.*; postage 2*d.*

BISHOP WILSON (Sodor and Man) **ON THE** LORD'S SUPPER. Rubricated Edition. With Notes. In cloth 1*s.*; by post 1*s.* 1*d.*, or, With Appendix and copious Notes; in cloth, 2*s.*; in morocco, 5*s.* to 8*s.*; postage, 3*d.*

BISHOP WILSON'S SACRA PRIVATA. Rubricated Edition. In cloth, 2*s.*; in morocco, 5*s.* to 8*s.*; postage, 3*d.*

THE VENERABLE SACRAMENT OF THE ALTAR. By ST. THOMAS AQUINAS. Preface by the Rev. W. J. E. BENNETT. 3*s.*; by Post, 3*s.* 3*d.*

ON MEDITATION, DEVOTION, &c. *(continued.)*

THE SORROW OF JESUS. A Companion for Holy Week; intended for the use of Religious Societies. Third Edition. 1*s.*; by post, 1*s.* 1*d.*

BUND'S AIDS TO A HOLY LIFE; in Forms of Self-Examination. New Edition, 1*s.*; by post, 1*s.* 1*d.*

PRAYERS AND NOTES: extracted from the MSS. of the late Sir Robert and Lady Wilmot, of Chaddesden: with Preface by the Rev. T. T. CARTER, Clewer. 7*s.* 6*d.*; by post, 8*s.*

SHORT PRAYERS FOR BUSY MEN AND WOMEN. From a Bodleian MS. 2*d.*; by post, 3*d.*

PRAYERS FOR CHILDREN; with DEVOTIONS for the HOLY SACRIFICE, HYMNS, &c. By Rev. F. G. LEE, D.C.L. With Frontispiece. 1*s.*; by post, 1*s.* 1*d.*

DEVOTIONS FOR SISTERS OF MERCY. Edited by the Rev. T. CARTER, Clewer. Part I.—For Daily Use, 1*s.* 6*d.*; by post, 1*s.* 7*d.* II.—Different Necessities, 1*s.*; by post, 1*s.* 1*d.* III.—Forgiveness of Sins, 1*s.*; by post, 1*s.* 1*d.* IV.—Holy Communion, 2*s.*; by post, 2*s.* 2*d.* V.—To the Holy Ghost, 1*s.*; by post, 1*s.* 1*d.* VI.—To our Lord, 1*s.*; by post, 1*s.* 1*d.* VII.—On The Passion, 1*s.*; by post, 1*s.* 1*d.* VIII.—On Sickness, 1*s.* 6*d.*; by post, 1*s.* 7*d.* Two vols., cloth, 10*s.*; postage, 8*d.*

THE LITTLE HOURS FOR BUSY PERSONS. By an ASSOCIATE of the CLEWER SISTERHOOD. 4*d.*; by post, 4½*d.*

SIX STEPS TO PERFECTION. Cut from the Works of M. Olier. By same Author. 4*d.*; by post, 4½*d.*

HINTS ON RELIGIOUS EDUCATION. By same Author. 6*d.*; by post, 6½*d.*

A PRAYER BOOK FOR THE YOUNG; or a Com-plete Guide to Public and Private Devotion. Edited by CHARLES WALKER. Second Edition, carefully Revised and Re-arranged. 700 pages. 4*s.*; by post, 4*s.* 3*d.* In various morocco bindings, 7*s.*, 6*d.* to 12*s.* 6*d.*; postage, 6*d.* Cheap Edition, 3*s.*; by post. 3*s.* 2*d.*

THE LAST HOURS OF JESUS: being Colloquies on The Passion. From the German. 6*d.*; by post, 7*d.*

SUGGESTIONS FOR THE DUE AND REVERENT CELEBRATION OF THE HOLY EUCHARIST. 6*d.*; by Post, 7*d.*

ON MEDITATION, DEVOTION, &c. (*continued.*)

SHORT DAILY READINGS AT FAMILY OR PRIVATE PRAYER, mainly drawn from Ancient Sources; following the Church's Course of Teaching for the Year. By Rev. J. B. WILKINSON. Vol. I., from Advent to Lent; II., Lent to Ascension; III., From Ascension to Sixteenth Sunday after Trinity. IV., completing Trinity-tide, with Readings for all the Saints' Days. In four Volumes. Separated, each 5*s.* 6*d.*; by post, 6*s.*

REPENTANCE AND HOLY LIVING: being Meditations on the Lord's Prayer and the Seven Penitential Psalms. By the Rev. J. B. WILKINSON, Author of "The Parables," &c. 2*s.* 6*d.*; by post, 2*s.* 8*d.*

THE PARABLES OF OUR LORD: THIRTY-SIX INSTRUCTIONS THEREON; BEING PLAIN SERMONS ON THESE SUBJECTS By Rev. J. B. WILKINSON. 6*s.*; by post, 6*s.* 4*d.*

MEDITATIONS ON THE PENITENTIAL PSALMS. By the Rev. J. B. WILKINSON. 1*s.*; by post, 1*s.* 1*d.*

MEDITATIONS ON THE LORD'S PRAYER. By Rev. J. B. WILKINSON. 1*s.* 6*d.*, by post, 1*s.* 7*d.*

AIDS TO MENTAL PRAYER, &c. By Rev. J. B. WILKINSON, Author of "Daily Readings," "On the Parables," &c. 1*s.* 6*d.*; by post, 1*s.* 7*d.*

HOUSEHOLD PRAYERS. Preface by Dr. WILBERFORCE, Bishop of Winchester. 1*s.*; by post, 1*s.* 1*d.*

THE REFORMED MONASTERY; or, THE LOVE OF JESUS: A Sure and Short, Pleasant and Easy Way to Heaven; in Meditations, Directions, and Resolutions to Love and Obey Jesus unto Death. Preface by the Rev. F. G. LEE, D.C.L. (Being a Reprint of the said Work by Dr. BOILEAU, Chaplain to Dr. Fell, Bishop of Oxford, 1675.) 3*s.*; by post, 3*s.* 4*d.*

FENELON'S COUNSELS TO THOSE WHO ARE LIVING IN THE WORLD. Edited by W. J. E. BENNETT, Froome-Selwood. Large paper Edition, calf, 4*s.* 6*d.*, by post, 4*s.* 8*d.* Cheaper Edition, 1*s.*; stiff cloth, red edges, 1*s.* 6*d.*; postage, 1*d.*

ON MEDITATION, DEVOTION, &c. (*continued.*)

LITANIES, TRANSLATED BY THE LATE REV. DR. NEALE:—On the Resurrection—On the Holy Name—Of the Holy Ghost—For the Saints—Of the Blessed Sacrament—Of Reparation to the Blessed Sacrament—Of the Passion—For the Faithful Departed; together with "The Way of the Cross," and "The Hours of the Passion." cloth limp, 1*s.* 6*d.*; cloth turned in, 2*s.*; postage, 1*d.*

ADVICE TO THE YOUNG ON TEMPTATION IN SIN. By Monsignor DE SEGUR. 1*s.* 6*d*; by post, 1*s.* 8*d.*

PONDER AND PRAY: THE PENITENT'S PATHWAY. Translated by Rev. F. HUMPHREY. 2*s.*; by post, 2*s.* 2*d.*

THE DUTIES OF FATHERS AND MOTHERS. By ARVISENET. Edited by the Rev. G. C. WHITE, S. Barnabas', Pimlico. 1*s.* 6*d.*; by post, 1*s.* 7*d.*

AVRILLON'S DEVOTIONS AT THE BLESSED SACRAMENT. (Translated). 1*s.*; by post, 1*s.* 1*d.*

THE LITTLE WAY OF PARADISE. Translated from the Italian. 2*s.*; by post, 2*s.* 2*d.*

DEVOTIONS ON THE COMMUNION OF SAINTS. Compiled from the "Paradise for the Christian Soul," and other sources. For the use of English Churchmen. Part I.—Communion with the Faithful Departed. Part II.—Communion with the Saints and Angels. By CHARLES WALKER, Author of "The Liturgy of the Church of Sarum," "The Ritual Reason Why," &c. With Preface by RICHARD F. LITTLEDALE, LL.D., D.C.L. 2*s.* 6*d.*; by post, 2*s.* 8*d.*

ON CHRISTIAN CARE OF THE DYING AND THE DEAD. Illustrated. 3*s.* 6*d.*; by post, 3*s.* 9*d.*

THE OFFICE OF TENEBRÆ. Second Edition. (Published for the Guild of S. Alban.) 1*s.* 6*d.*; by post, 1*s.* 8d. The Words only, 2*d.*; by post, 2½*d.*

FASTING VERSUS EVENING COMMUNION. By F. H. D. 6*d.*; by post, 7*d.*

IMPRESSIONS OF THE AMMERGAU PASSION-PLAY. (1870.) By an Oxonian. 6*d.*; by post, 7*d.*

TALES, &c.

THE CITY OF THE PLAIN, AND OTHER TALES. With Preface by Rev. E. H. BLYTH, Hammersmith. 2*s.*, by post, 2*s.* 2*d.*

LOVE AND HATE. By Author of "An Object in Life," "Our Christian Calling," "Letters to Young Servants," &c. 2*s.*; by post, 2*s.* 2*d.*

THE ROYAL CRADLE; and other Carols. By S. D. N., Author of "Chronicles of St. Mary's." 2*s.* 6*d.*; by post, 2*s.* 8*d.*

THE SAINTS OF OLD; being Sketches of the Holy Days in the Kalendar of the English Church. By Author of "Church Stories for Sundays, &c.," "Our Childhood's Pattern," &c. 3*s.*; by post, 3*s.* 4*d.*

CHURCH STORIES FOR THE SUNDAYS, HOLY-DAYS, AND FAST-DAYS OF THE CHRISTIAN YEAR. In Fifteen Parts. Each, 1*s.*; by post, 1*s.* 1½*d.* Or, in Four Vols. Cloth, each 5*s.*; by post, 5*s.* 4½*d.* And in Eight thinner Vols. Cloth, each 2*s.* 6*d.*; postage, 2½*d.*

OUR CHILDHOOD'S PATTERN: BEING NINE TALES BASED ON INCIDENTS IN THE LIFE OF THE HOLY CHILD JESUS. By Author of "Church Stories for Sundays," &c.; and "Saints of Old," &c, 2*s.* 6*d.*; by post, 2*s.* 9*d.*

CURIOSITIES OF OLDEN TIMES. A new work by the Rev. S. BARING-GOULD. 6*s.*; by post, 6*s.* 4*d.*

OSWALD, THE YOUNG ARTIST. A Tale for Boys. (Inculcating the necessity of a reverential attention when assisting in the Public Worship.) By C. WALKER, Author of "The Ritual Reason Why." 1*s.* 6*d.*; by post, 1*s.* 8*d.*

NORWEGIAN TALES; EVENINGS AT OAK-WOOD. Translated by ELLEN WHITE. Preface by Rev. S. BARING-GOULD, Author of "Curious Myths," &c. 3*s.* 6*d.* by post, 3*s.* 9*d.*

COUSIN EUSTACE; or CONVERSATIONS WITH A DISSENTER ON THE PRAYER BOOK. By the Author of "Tales of Kirkbeck," "Aunt Atta," "Lives of the Fathers," &c. 5*s.* 6*d.*; by post, 6*s.*

RHINELAND AND ITS LEGENDS; with Other Tales. Translated from the German. By the Translator of "God still works Miracles," &c. With Preface by W. J. E. BENNETT. 3*s.* 6*d.*; by post, 3*s.* 9*d.*

TALES, &c. (*continued.*)

CHURCH BALLADS (First Series.) In a Packet of Twelve. 2*s.*; by post, 2*s.* 2*d.*

CHURCH BALLADS (Second Series) **FOR THE FESTIVALS THROUGHOUT THE YEAR.** Specially suitable for Young Persons or for use in the Parish or Schools. By the Author of "Church Ballads, First Series." 3*s.* 6*d.*; by post, 3*s.* 9*d.*

WAYLAND WELL: A Tale for Adults. By the Author of "Crystal Finlaison's Narrative," &c. 5*s.*; by post, 5*s.* 5*d.*

ONLY A GHOST. By **IRENÆUS THE DEACON.** 1*s.*; by post, 1*s.* 1*d.*

DEEPDENE MINSTER; or, **SHADOW AND SUNSHINE.** By C. MACGREGOR. 1*s.* 6*d.*; by post, 1*s.* 7*d.*

SIR HENRY APPLETON: A Tale of the Great Rebellion. By the Rev. W. E. HEYGATE, Rector of Brighstone, Isle of Wight. 470 pp. 5*s.*; by post, 5*s.* 6*d.*

TALES OF KIRKBECK. First, Second, and Third Series. By Author of "Cousin Eustace," &c. Preface by W. J. E. BENNETT. Each Vol. 3*s.* 6*d.*; by post, 3*s.* 10*d.*

A COMMON-PLACE STORY: by Author of "Cousin Eustace," "Tales of Kirkbeck," &c. Edited by W. J. E. BENNETT. 3*s.* 6*d.*; by post, 3*s.* 10*d.*

AUNT ATTA. A Tale for little Nephews and Nieces. By Author of "Tales of Kirkbeck," &c. Edited by W. J. E. BENNETT. 3*s.* 6*d.*; by post, 3*s.* 9*d.* Cheap Edition 2*s.* 6*d.*; by post, 2*s.* 8*d.*

AUNT ATTA AGAIN; or. **THE LONG VACATION.** Edited by W. J. E. BENNETT. 3*s.* 6*d.*; by post 3*s.* 9*d.* Cheap Edition 2*s.* 6*d.*; by post, 2*s.* 8*d.*

THE FARM OF APTONGA: A Story of the Times of S. Cyprian. By the late Dr. NEALE. 2*s.*; by post, 2*s.* 2*d.*

DAYS AT LEIGHSCOMBE. A New Tale for Children. 2*s.*; by post, 2*s.* 2*d.*

THREE STORIES by the Author of "Days at Leighscombe." 2*s.* 6*d.*; by post 2*s.* 9*d.*

A LONG DAY. By the Author of "Days at Leighscombe." 6*d.*; by post, 6½*d.*

USE OF A FLOWER. By the Author of "Days at Leighscombe." 9*d.* by post, 9½*d.*

WHILE THE RAIN LASTED. By the Author of "Days at Leighscombe." 9*d.* by post 9½*d.*

TALES, &c. (*continued.*)

CHRISTINE; OR, THE KING'S DAUGHTER. 2*s.*; by post, 2*s.* 2*d.*

THE CHILDREN'S GUILD. By Author of The Abbey Farm." 2*s.* 6*d.*; by post, 2*s.* 9*d.*

FROM DARKNESS TO LIGHT. A new Confirmation Tale. 2*s.* 6*d.*; by post, 2*s.* 9*d.*

THE VICTORIES OF THE SAINTS: Stories for Children, from Church History. New Edition. By Rev. Dr. NEALE. 2*s.*; by post, 2*s.* 2*d.*

THE PILGRIM; AND OTHER ALLEGORIES. 1*s.* 6*d.*; by post, 1*s.* 8*d.*

HENRY OF EICHENFELS, AND CHRISTMAS EVE. By Rev. W. B. FLOWER. 1*s.*; by post, 1*s.* 1*d.*

REGINALD GRÆME; By the Rev. CLAUDE MAGNAY. 2*s.* 6*d.*; by post, 2*s.* 8*d.*

BLANCHE MORTIMER. By E. M. S. 3*s.*; by post, 3*s.* 2*d.*

THE LIFE OF S. PAUL. By Rev. Dr. BIBER. 2*s.* 6*d.*; by post, 2*s.* 9*d.*

HISTORICAL LECTURES ON THE EARLY BRITISH, ANGLO-SAXON, AND NORMAN PERIOD. Intended for the Use of Teachers of English History. By Mrs. FRANCES A. TREVELYAN. Partly Edited by the late Rev. CHARLES MARRIOTT, Oriel College, Oxford. (I. Roman Invasion to the Norman Conquest. II. William I. to Henry II. III. Henry II. to Henry III.) Each Volume 7*s.* 6*d.*; by post, 8*s.*

SPANISH TOWNS AND SPANISH PICTURES. By Mrs. W. A. TOLLEMACHE. With Photographs, &c. Second Edition, 7*s.* 6*d.*; by post, 8*s.*

RESURGAM, AND OTHER VERSES. By the late G. F. JACKSON. Edited with a short Biography by his Brother, the Rev. H. MARSHALL JACKSON 3*s.*; by post, 3*s.* 3*d.*

J. T. HAYES, LYALL PLACE, EATON SQUARE;
AND
HENRIETTA TREET, COVENT GARDEN.

1866 - Reorganization Acts